

No Evidence FOR Diocesan Churches, OR, ANY BISHOPS WITHOUT The Choice or Consent of the PEOPLE, IN THE Primitive Times.

O R,

An ANSWER to the Allegations out of
Antiquity for such Churches, and against Popular
Elections of Bishops: In a late Volume, Intituted,
The Unreasonableness of Separation:

SHEWING,

David Clark son

That they do not serve the Design for which they
are Produced.

The Episcopal men will hardly find any Evidence in Scripture, or the Practice of the Apostles, for Churches consisting of many fixed Congregations for Worship, under the Charge of one Person; nor in the Primitive Church, for the Ordination of a Bishop, without the preceding Election of the Clergy, and at least consent and approbation of the People. Dr. St. Iren. p. 416.

London, Printed for Thomas Parkhurst at the Bible and Three Crowns
in Cheapside, near Mercers-Chapel. 1681.

No Evidence for Material Evidence of any Bishop's Writings The Good Company of the Poor in the Primitive Times

An ANSWER to the Allusion one of
Williams for poor Chapman, and others
of his party to Dingley. It is a poor
kind of answer, but the best I can
make, and I hope it will be
sufficient for the purpose.

THE CHIEF WORKS
OF THE DESIGNER FOR MICHIGAN.
THESE PICTURES ARE THE PROPERTY OF
THE CHIEF WORKS OF THE DESIGNER FOR MICHIGAN.

part of the body. Dr. J. W. E. 16.

1881, during the next year, the author of this paper, in a visit to the
University of California, San Francisco, California, was shown a
specimen of *Leucaspis* collected by Dr. J. C. Gahan, of the
University of California, from a specimen of *Acacia* growing in
the San Joaquin Valley, California.

AN

ADVERTISEMENT.

THE Author would neither have begun nor ended this Discourse so as the Reader finds it, if he had at first design'd it for publick view, or been willing to engage himself in this unhappy contest. He was moved to examine the learned part of the Reverend Dr.'s Volume, because he found it not at first view, agreeable to what upon some converse with the Ancients, he had long taken to be the fence and practice of the Church, especially in the first and best Ages. He was encouraged to pursue the enquiry, because the issue thereof, however it proved, could be no other than was very desirable. For he could not but count it an advantage, either to have his apprehensions rectified, if he were mistaken; or to be confirmed in his Judgment if it were right, and that by a person of such eminency, as he knows none of his standing, superior to him for learning in the Church of England. So that what he aimed at, when he first undertook it, was his own private Satisfaction; but some papers being got out of his hands, he found himself brought

*

brought to these Terms, that either he must publish them himself, or have it done by others; and had only the liberty to chuse which of these he counted most tolerable.

Of what consideration the points here discussed are in reference to the main question under debate, may soon be discerned. If there were no Diocesan Churches, nor Bishops without the Choice or Consent of the People, in the Primitive times; then the imputation of Schism with respect thereto, is not over-reasonably fixed on Dissenters. For with what reason can they be branded as Schismatics for declining such Churches, and not submitting to such Bishops, as the Church in the best Ages of Christianity, either did not know, or would not own? In this case either we must be acquitted, or the Primitive and Universal Church will be involved in the same condemnation with us. And the charge of Schism is in danger to recoil here. It is counted on all hands, far more Schismatical to divide from the Universal Church, especially in its Primitive integrity; than from any particular Church in degenerate times: And doth it not look very like such a dividing from the prime Catholick Church, when this is relinquished in matters of so great concern; so that such Churches are formed as were unknown to the Christian World in the first and best times; and Bishops of those Churches are only owned, and set over them in such a way as was universally disclaimed both then, and in many Ages after?

ter? If adhering to these Churches (and to none else but in dependance on them) and resigning our selves up to those Bishops as our Pastors, be made so necessary; that those are counted none of the Church, or worthy to be cast out, who yield not thereto: We need not fear, in these circumstances, to let our accusers be Judges who are the Schismaticks, when they are under no Temptation to be partial. "A Church (saies Dr. "St.) may Separate her self from the Communion of the "Catholick by taking upon her to make such things the "necessary conditions of her Communion, which never "were the Conditions of Communion with the Catholick "Church. — The Being of the Catholick Church "lies in Essentials: for a particular Church to disagree "from all other particular Churches in some extrinse- "cal and accidental things, is not to Separate from the "Catholick Church, so as to cease to be a Church; "but still, whatever Church makes such extrinsical "things the necessary Conditions of Communion, so as "to cast men out of the Church who yield not to them, "is Schismatical in so doing; for it thereby divides "it self from the Catholick Church: And the Separa- "tion from it is so far from being Schism, that be- "ing cast out of that Church on those Terms, only re- "turns them to the Communion of the Catholick "Church. On which grounds it will appear that yours "is the Schismatrical Church, and not ours. — Not "only persons, but Churches may depart from the Ca-

“tholick Church; and in such Cases not those who
“depart from the Communion of such Churches, but
“those Churches which departed from the Catholick
“are guilty of the Schism.

Rational Ac-
count. part. 2.
chap. 4. Sect. 3.
p. 358, 359.

Upon whom this Sentence falls, and who are acquitted
hereby, may be easily discerned; if there be no evi-
dence that the Churches and Bishops in question,
now made so necessary, were known or owned in
the Primitive times. And I know not from whom
this Evidence can be expected, if not from so excellent
a person as Dr. St. when he has made it his business
to produce it. Whether he has done it or not, is left
to the Judgment of the impartial, upon the perusing
of what follows.

ERRATA.

Page 7. line 9. r. 200000. p. 11. l. 12, 13. r. Germania, p. 20. l. 30. dele ts,
p. 21. l. 13. r. whrr, for tigby p. 38. l. 17, 24. p. 39. l. 9. p. 40. l. 1, 17.
r. 800.

No

No Evidence for Diocesan Churches, or any Bishops without the Choice or Consent of the People, in the Primitive Times.



THE Testimonies of the *Ancients* which the Reverend and Learned Dr. makes use of, concern two heads, and are alledged either for *Diocesan Churches*, or against *popular Elections* of Bishops. Before I come to examine the former particularly, let it be observed in general, that those Reverend persons whom the Dr. opposes, make account that in the Primitive times a Regular Church was but a *particular Congregation*, and constituted of no more than might conveniently meet together for Church-communion. Yet they deny not but there might be in after-times some *Heterocrites*, Churches extraordinarily numerous, so as they could not ordinarily and with convenience hold personal Communion in one place; but they find no Instances hereof in the two first Ages of Christianity, nor Evidence for any Number in the *third*, nor in the best part of the *fourth* for very many, compared with the rest which transgressed not the Primitive and Regular bounds. And this they judge will be no great prejudice to their Hypothesis. He that shews three or four men (among many thousands) corpulent, overgrown

and of extraordinary Stature; doth not thereby prove that the rest are not commonly of a regular proportion, more like men than Giants. If those so numerous Churches could be thought on that account to have been *Dioceſans*, yet could it not be from thence inferred that the ancient Churches were commonly *Dioceſan*, unless we may draw a general Conclusion from that which is very rare and extraordinary. But indeed it cannot hence be proved that those few Churches, consisting of so very numerous Members, were like the *Dioceſans* now contended for. It is just here as it is with our *Parishes* in *England*, besides those of a common and ordinary size, there are some which are excessively numerous, containing very many thousand Souls, some thirty or forty, or fifty, or more thousands; yet it would be ridiculous to account each of these *Parishes* a *Dioceſe*; when all know the largest of them is but a small part of one. These *Parishes* at first contained no more than could meet for Worship in one place; Being in some Ages grown too populous to meet together, they should have been divided, so as to anſwer the ends of their first regular establishment; but continuing as they are, they pass still (as the lesser do) for ſingle Congregations, and these with hundreds of others make up but one *Dioceſan* Church. The ancient Churches are in these respects correspondent to these *Parishes*. So that if the Dr. had brought us ſome Instances of ancient *Episcopal* Churches as numerous as our great *Parishes*, containing many more than could well meet together, yet this would not have proved them *Dioceſan* Churches, no, nor more than ſome ſingle Congregations; but I think all that he produces amounts not to ſo much. This will appear by examining the severals alledged.

To

To prove that the Church of Carthage in Cyprian's ^{a Part. 3. Sec.} time was *more than a single Congregation* (and no less than a *Diocese*, which is the thing to be proved) he shews out of his Epistles, that there were *many Presbyters in that Church*. But this will be no proof to those who consider, that it was the practice of old to multiply Presbyters and other Officers, beyond what we count necessary. Dr. Downham saies, at first the number of Christians in Cities were sometimes not much greater than the number of Presbyters among them. His words are these, *Indeed at the very first Conversions of Cities, the whole number of the people converted (being sometimes not much greater than the number of Presbyters placed among them,) were able to make but a small Congregation*^b. Such a number of Presbyters would be far from proving a Church in such Cities to be more than a single Congregation, much farther from proving it to be as large as a *Diocese*. This practice which the Bishop will have to be Primitive, of making so many Presbyters in one Church, was followed in after times. Nazianzen tells us in the fourth Age, that sometimes the Officers in a Church did well nigh exceed the number of those whom they ruled, *τότε γέλεται πλειστοί εἰσιν διεκονεῖται*^c. How then can *forty six or sixty* Presbyters be an argument that the Church where they were was as large as a *Diocese*, or larger than the greatest Congregation? Justinian observing that Officers in Churches were multiplied beyond reason and measure, takes order that they should be reduced to the numbers at the first establishment, but in the great Church at *Constantinople*, he would have the Presbyters brought down to *sixty*. No doubt they were numerous in *Constantine's* time, who endeavoured to make that City *in all things equal to Rome*, *ισαυραν τον* ^d *πόλιν*.

^b *Definit. L. 2.*
Cap. 1. Pag.
6.

^c *Orat. 1.*

^d *πόλιν*

^d Soc. L. 2.
^e Cap. 2.

^d *Parvus, and built two Churches in it,* sayes the *Historian* ^d. Yet in the latter end of his Reign, after the death of *Arius*, the Christians there could all meet together for Worship. It is said expressly, that *Alexander* Bishop of that Church, ^{avdēw ovv. māt̄ n̄s d̄s̄p̄s̄ im-}

^e Theodoret. L. ¹⁴ Cap. 5.
^f 1. Cap. 14.

But there is one passage afterwards which may seem more considerable. ^f *Par. 230. At Carthage we have this evidence of the great number of Christians, that in the time of Persecution, although very many stood firm, yet the number of the lapsed was so great, that St. Cyprian saith, every day thousands of Tickets were granted by the Martyrs and Confessours in their behalf for Reconciliation to the Church.* And in one of those *Tickets* sometimes might be comprehended twenty or thirty Persons, *the form being, Communicet ille cum suis.*

^f *Sermo de Lapsedis.*

The Numbers of the *Lapsed* were great, it seems by *Cyprians* expression ^f, they were the greatest part of his Church; for he sayes, *The greatest part of the Brethren denied the Faith, (Maximus Fratrum numerus Fidem suam prodidit,) at the first approach of the Persecution, before they were apprehended, or so much as inquired after, besides those that fell when the danger was nearer, and the tryal more sharp.* Elsewhere he tells us, that this wasting Persecution did al-

^g *Lib. 4. Ep. 4. Initio.* *most unpeople his Church* ^g, and he mentions *numeris am-*

Languentium Stragem, & exiguum stantium paucitatem, signifying that those who fell were *many*, those that stood but *very few* ^h.

Very many hundreds are not necessary to make a company numerous, and very few added to those (or to some thousands) will not make the Church of *Carthage* so exceeding great as some seem to imagine it. However the *lapsed* were not near so many as is here insinuated. For by this reckon-

reckoning the *lapsed* Christians at *Carthage* will be more by many *Myriads* than all the Inhabitants of the City, Christians and Heathens together. For suppose these *thousands* of *Tickets* were but two or three thousand, and *every day* amounted but to *ten* dayes; and the numbers in each *Ticket*, reckoned *sometimes twenty*, *sometimes thirty*, were but one with another *ten*, the numbers of the *lapsed* will be *300000*; whereas all the Inhabitants were not above *20000*. as we may well suppose, since the Inhabitants of *Antioch*, a greater and more populous City (as Authors generally report it,) were no more, as *Chrysostom* who well knew it, gives the account, *exon puerulus* i. Therefore the thousands here must pass, as is ordinary in all Authors, for *very many*. So *Eusebius* sayes there were *puer*, thousands of Bishops in a Synod of *Antioch* for the censure of *Paulus Samosatenus* ^k. And another ancient Author speaks of thousands of Bishops at the Council of *Chalcedon* ^{*,} whereas there was but about *600* at the latter, and not so many by far at the former. Thus *Theodore* giving an account of his Preaching at *Antioch*, saith it was known, that *many Myriads* (*μυριάς* *puerulus*) did meet in one place to hear; whereas two or three *Myriads* are more than can well hear any one preach. And then the *Tickets* comprehending *twenty* or *thirty* (which multiply the numbers of the *lapsed* excessively) must be left out of the reckoning, for there was none such granted by the *Martyrs*, as *Cyprian* declares in the *Epistle* cited. Though there were some drawn up in such a blind form (*Communicebat ille cum suis*) as might include *twenty* or *thirty*, yet saies he, *Nunquam omnino a Martyribus factum est*¹, this was never done by the *Martyrs*. Thus the expression *Ep. 5.* will amount to no more than this; the *Martyrs* were *daily solicited and importuned*, to

ⁱ *Orat. in Ignat.*
^{Tom. 5. No. 2.}

^k *Hist. Lib. 7.*
^{Cap. 23.}

^{* Vid. et cetera.}
^{ep. Subsist. in}
^{Council. Chalced.}

^{Ep. 83.}

¹ *Lib. 3. Ep. 13.*

grant

grant great numbers of Tickets. So it can't be hence concluded that the Christians at *Carthage* were more, or so many as are in some of our Parishes. It is manifest by many plain passages in *Cyprian*, that his whole Church (which in his stile is, *Plebs universa omnes sanctae Ecclesie tota Fraternitas*,) did frequently meet together, both for Acts of Worship, and other Church affairs, which as they inforce the sense I have given of the expression alledged, on those who will have *Cyprian* consistent with himself; so may convince all, who weigh them impartially, that the Christians then at *Carthage* were nothing near so many as the Dr. supposes.

In the next head, pag. 230. that which he would prove, if we may judge by his Conclusion, pag. 231, 232. is, that the power of Discipline was not then supposed to be in the Congregation, or that they were the first subject of the power of the Keys, and that they thought it not then in the power of the People to appoint and ordain their own Officers. But this Dr. O. no were asserts, if I understand him, and so it might have been spared. However he proves it, let us see how. 'The Presbyters and the whole Church were under the particular care and government of St. *Cyprian* as their Bishop, p. 230.

The Presbyters were then no wayes under the Government of the Bishop, but as those that are *joint Rulers* may be said to be under the government of one another. The whole Church was not under the Bishops government alone, but was ruled jointly by the Bishop and Elders. That the Presbyters and Bishop concurred in the government, is acknowledged by the best assertors of Episcopacy amongst us, Dr. *Field*, Bishop *Downham*, Bishop *Hall*, Mr. *Thorn-dike*, *Primate Usher*, &c. Dr. *St*, doth not deny it,

nay,

nay, he elsewhere asserts and proves ⁱⁿ it by many ancient testimonies, *Cyprian* particularly. ^{in Iren. pag. 335, 336. 354.} ‘Thus *Cor. 355.* *pelius* at *Rome*—Thus *Cyprian* at *Carthage*, one who pleads as much as any for obedience to Bishops; and yet none more evident for the presence and joint concurrence and assistance of the Clergy at all Church debates, &c. And to prevent the usual evasion, he adds, ‘That they concurred in governing the Church, and not only by their *Counsel*, but *Authority*, appears from the general sense of the Church, even when Episcopacy was at the highest.

There is nothing in the passages here produced out of *Cyprian*, that can be in the least serviceable ^{P. 230, 231.} ^{233.} to prove the *sole jurisdiction* of a Bishop. The import of them is no more, but that in matters of Discipline, the People and Elders should do nothing without him; even as he declared that he would do nothing without them. How this sets the Church of *Carthage* at any distance from *Dr. O's Hypothesis*, I understand not.

Nor can I apprehend how the third *head* crosses the ^{Pag. 232.} *Dr.* more than others, or more than himself. That the *Pastoral authority* for governing a Church is of *divine institution*, is not denied, but that the *superiority* or preeminence of a Bishop above Presbyters is of such institution, *Cyprian* sayes not, nor is it the sense of any of the *Ancients*, as *Dr. St.* hath declared heretofore (and retracts not here) proving it by the testimonies of *Jerom*, *Hillary*, *Augustine*, *Isidore*, and a Council at *Sevil*ⁿ; shewing also how expressions in the *ancient Writers*, which seem to be of another tendency, are to be understood ^o.

^{Pag. 233.} Let the Reader now judge whether ^{315.} these be the strokes and lineaments of the Congregational way.

If the Dr. had thought fit to take notice of the *strokes* and *lineaments* of the Congregational way, supposed to be apparent in St. Cyprian's Writings, he should have produced something out of him against these severals. 1. That a Church then was but a single Congregation, consisting of no more than could meet together for Personal Communion. 2. That this Church was not under the government of any other Bishops or Rulers besides their own Bishop and Officers. 3. That the concerns of this Congregation were not ordered without the common consent of the People belonging to it. If it be plain in *Cyprian* that this was the State of the Church at *Carthage*, it will be the more considerable because the Dr. tells us, that *Cyprian speaks of nothing peculiar to his own Church, but what was generally observed over the Christian World.*

I meet with no more out of Antiquity to this purpose, till we come to pag. 245. there he offers two *Observables*, and fortifies them with ancient Testimonies.

Obs. 1. That it was an *inviolable Rule* amongst them, that there was to be but one Bishop in a City, though the City were never so large, or the Christians never so many.

This was no *inviolable Rule*. No Rule at all in *Scripture*, none such observed or known in *Scripture-times*. Those that are for *Episcopacy* in its greatest elevation, maintain, that there were more Bishops than one in a City, particularly *Jerusalem, Antioch, Rome, Ephesus, &c.* in and after the *Apostles times*. Others that proceed upon other grounds, find in *one City* more of those who in *Scripture Style* are *Bishops*, though not in the *Style of after-times*. *Phil. 1. Acts 20. 17, &c.* Dr. Sr. himself must either hold that there

there were no Bishops in Scripture-times, or more of them than one in a City: for he acknowledges that in the Apostles times in one Church there were more Presbyters than one; and yet ascribes the *superiority* which makes the difference between a Bishop and Presbyters, not to divine or Apostolical appointment, or any act of the Apostles; but to *humane Institution, and an act of the Church.*

This Rule might well be observed in Cities where there were no more Christians than there are in a single Congregation; and this is supposed to be the case of *Carthage*, and other Churches in *Cyprians* time and after, nor has Dr. *St.* brought any thing sufficient to disprove it; and therefore *Cyprians* Testimonies for *one Bishop* might have been spared. Nor is there any ground to conclude that the *1 Theff. 5. 12, 13. Heb. 13. 17.* were not so understood by the *African* Churches, as they are by *M. B.* And *Cyprian* who is so positive for *one Bishop*, is as peremptory but for *one Flock*. *Esse posse uno in loco aliquis existimat aut multos Pastores, aut plures greges* ^{P.} *Can any one* ^{P. Dennisate} *Ecclie.* *imagine that in one place, there should be either more Pastors, or more Flocks?* *viz.* More than one. But the *Diocesans* now pleaded for, may have many hundred Flocks, and but one Pastor.

When there were more Christians in a City than one Bishop could perform the Duties of a Pastor to, this Rule might afterwards be observed, though not *inviolably* and without exception; no, nor where Christians were less numerous. At *Jerusalem* when *Narcissus* had the *Chair*, not to mention those who were Bishops there in his retirement, (*Dius* and *Germanicon*;) *Gordius* was in the *Seat* when he returned, and resumed the *Bishoprick*, and *Alexander* was afterwards made Bishop with him ^{q.} At *Cæsarea*, *Theo-* ^{q. Eustib. Lib. 6. Cap. 10, 11.} *tecnus*

teenus and *Anatolius* were for some time Bishops together. Afterwards *Macarius* and *Maximus* were at once Bishops in that Church^s. *Epiphanius* (alleged by *Grotius** for this purpose) signifies that other Cities had two Bishops, and excepts but one. *Alexandria* had never two Bishops, as is *alexandrinus*, as other Cities had. His meaning cannot be (as a great Antiquary would have it) that *Alexandria* was never so divided, as that several parties in it should have their respective Bishops there. For so it was divided in the time of *Epiphanius*, when the Catholicks had *Athanasius*, the *Arians* had *Gregorius*, and then *Georgius*; and afterwards the one had *Peter*, the other *Lucius*. And the *Novatians* had their Bishops successively in that City, till *Cyril's* time. But to wave other Instances, let me only add one, yet such a one as is pregnant, comprising very many at once, and shews this was customary in the Churches every where through the world.

Valerius made *Augustine* Bishop with him at *Hippo*, with the concurrence of the Bishops in those parts, who assured *Augustine* that this was usual, and proved it by Examples both in the *African* and *transmarine* Churches, as *Possidonus* tells us^t. And *Augustine* alleges nothing to hinder him from making *Eradius* Bishop with him, when he designed him to be his Successour, but only the prohibition of the *Nicene Council*^u. That is the first Rule we meet with against it^v, and there it is not directly prohibited, but only by Insinuation. Afterwards the Bishops were more positive in forbidding it, having in time discovered a very cogent reason for it, assigned by a Synod in the middle of the seventh Age^x, *Nē res Ecclesie seva divisione debeant partiri, Lest the Churches' Revenues should be divided*, and so one Bishop should not have all, which seemed a *cruel* thing to those Fathers.

But

^r *Idem ibid.*^s *Lib. 7. Cap. 32.*^t *Soz. Lib. 2.*^{Cap. 19.}^{*} *De Imp.**Summ. potest.**C. 11. S. 11.**Her. 68. m. 8.**Socrat. 1.7. c. 7.*^t *Vit. Aug.*^{cap. 8.}^u *Ep. 110.*^v *Can. 8.*^x *Cabillon. 1.**Can. 4.*

But to return to former Ages; where the custom continued of having but one Bishop in a City when the multitude of Christians in it required more, the practice of their Predecessors was pleaded for it; when the case was quite altered, and the *reason* which had lead them to it in better times, was not extant. As if in the behalf of some Parishes amongst us, grown in time extraordinarily populous, so as some thousands of the Inhabitants cannot meet at once in the Parish Church, it should be alledged, that they ought not to be divided into distinct Rectories, because each of them was but one Parish under one Rector at first, and for some Ages since: when the *reason* why it was but *one* at first, and after, was because it contained not too many for *one*. If any offer to derive it from a higher Original, and pretend it was from *Apostolical Tradition*, Dr. St. tells us, they did it upon a mistake, *judging of the practice of the Apostles by that of their own times*.

y Imm. p. 317.

Yet in Cities so well replenished with Christians, where the Bishop had Assistants joined with him, each of which had, and exercised the intire power of Pastors, an honorary presidency only reserved to the Bishop, M. B. will not say the instituted *species* of Government is there alter'd: nor that this is like such a *Dioceſan* Church where there are many *myriads* of Christians, more than all the Inhabitants of *Carthage* amounted to, all under one Bishop as their *sole Pastor*.

PAG. 246. One of the greatest and most pernicious *Schisms* that ever happened, might have been prevented, if they had yielded to more Bishops than *one* in a *City*, and that was the Schism of the *Donatists* upon the competition between *Majorinus* and *Cacilian*.

I can-

I cannot conceive how yielding to more Bishops than one in a City might have prevented the Schism of the *Donatists*, unless the ancient Church had quite another *Idea* of Schism than D. *St.* has ; for he counts those Assemblies Schismatical, which differ less both in Opinion and Practice from those he allows, than the *Donatists* did from the *Catholicks*. The *Donatists* held that Ordinations by *Traditors* were null and void, that *Cæcilian* and many others, had no better Ordination ; and consequently those Churches must with them be no true Churches, their Officers were to be reordain'd, and the People rebaptized ; and this was their practice. Now I don't see any reason to think, that *Cæcilians* allowing the *Donatists* a Bishop in *Carthage* would have made them quit their Principles ; for they presumed they might have a Bishop of their own there, whether *Cæcilian* and his Party allow'd it or no ; and notwithstanding any disallowance had so actually, one Bishop succeeding another, for an hundred years together.

Pag. 246. Let *M. B.* reconcile these words to his *Hypothesis* if he can.

If the Church *Cyprian* speaks of contained no more than some *single* Congregation, which let D. *St.* disprove, *M. B.* will not find any difficulty in reconciling what *Cyprian* sayes against *Novatian* (for being chosen a Bishop in that City, where there was one before) to his own Hypothesis : for it amounts to no more than this, that there should be no more than one *Pastor* in the same Congregation ; and till the former be disproved, those testimonies *pag. 247, 248.* are to no purpose.

I see not how it can be justly inferred from what is alledged out of *St. Augustin*, concerning the proposal of *Melchiades*, *p. 248.* that *the best, the wisest, the most*

most moderate persons never once thought that there could be more Bishops than one in a City. What Melchiades proposes, doth not signify that he thought there was a necessity for but one Bishop, as if there could be no more; though he might think it not expedient where one was sufficient, and more were not like to agree together. St. *Augustin* himself who applauds the proposal, thought there might be more. He was actually Bishop of *Hippo* (as was shew'd before) together with *Valerius*. And he concur'd afterwards, with the rest of the *African* Bishops in allowing it elsewhere.

I find no such rule on both sides in the conference at *Carthage* as he next tells us of. But one Bishop to be allowed of either side of a City or Diocese. It's true both sides seem'd unwilling to own that they erected new Bishopricks, on purpose to make one party appear more numerous than the other: but none of them were disallowed upon this account, either as Bishops or actors in that Conference. All the Catholic Bishops there, and St. *Augustin* with them, in their Epistle to *Marcellinus*, there recited, offer the *Donatists*, that being reconciled, *nec honorem Episcopatus amittant*, they should continue Bishops. And afterwards in their greatest Councils they allow, that there might be two Bishops in one place on several occasions; particularly, if the *Donatists* Bishop was converted, then the place was to be divided between him and the other Bishop. This the Dr. takes notice of p. 251. and we shall do it further, when he leads us to it.

Sect. 9. Obs. 2. Pag. 249. 'In Cities and Dioceses which were under the care of one Bishop, there were several Congregations and Altars and distant places. *Carthage* was a very large City, &c. And there:

'there, besides the *Cathedral*, were several other considerable *Churches*, &c.

This was in the *fifth Age*. *Victor* ends his History in the latter end of it, about the Year 480. Now it is the *three first Ages* principally, wherein it is said, there were not more Christians than in some single Congregation, nor more fixed *Churches* than one in a City. In the *fourth* there might be more in some Cities, but those Cities were very few. *Petavius* could but name *two* in the latter end of that Age. In the *fifth Age* there might be more, but then the Church was greatly declining, as appears by the complaints of *Austin*, *Chrysostom*, *Isidore*, *Pelusiota*, *Propper*, *Salvian*, &c. The ambition and other extravagancies of the Bishops promoted it. *Chrysostome* in the violent prosecution which ended in his ejection and banishment, fayes he feared none so much as the Bishops. *καὶ νῦν ταῦτα δίδονται στρατιώται*. And the Bishops of those two Cities, *Rome* and *Alexandria*, which first transgressed the primitive bounds of *Churches*, are noted as the first that turn'd the *government*, of

Socrat. Hist. the Church into *domination*, and did it in that Age^a.

Lib. 7. Cap. 7. But yet there is reason to believe that the case was not much alter'd at *Carthage* in this Age, for though

there were very many brought over to Christianity, yet great numbers of them were with the *Donatists*. In *Carthage* it self, they had their Bishops in succession, *Majorinus*, *Donatus*, *Parmenianus*, *Primianus*, who was confirm'd in the Chair at *Carthage* by a Synod of 310 Bishops; *Maximianus* being declared Bishop there at the same time, by two other Synods; the one consisting of above fifty the other of above

August. Lib. 3. C. 4. contra Cheson. an hundred Bishops^b. So that it seems that *Seet* had two Bishops at once in *Carthage*, in the latter end of the *fourth Age*; and vying with the *Catholicks*

licks for numbers, they might have as many Churches as they. *Rebaptizante Donati parte maiorem multitudinem Afrorum*, the Donatists rebaptized the major part of the *Africans*, saith *Possidonius*^c. However the number of their Churches will not prove the thing in Question. Out of the Sermons *De Tempore*, and *De Diversis*, which go under St. *Austins* name, but are of uncertain Authors, and so are of little account, he reckons *eight* Churches; but there were more in *Alexandria* when the Christians did all meet there in one place. And since, after the disturbance by *Arius*, the Presbyters were not suffer'd to preach in *Alexandria*; either the people must meet in one place to hear the Bishop preach, or be without preaching^d.

^c *Vita Aug.*
Cap. 6.

M. B. proved that they did meet in one place, and I think his proof is still satisfying notwithstanding what is answered. Nor doth it appear that all those Churches were for Communion; they might communicate with the Bishop in the greater *Basilica*, and the rest might serve for other Offices, as *Damasus* (or whoever was the Writer of the Popes lives) saies, the 25. or 15. *Tituli* were erected at *Rome* by *Marcellus*, propter *Baptismum et penitentiam malorum et Sepulturam*. Hence *D. Taylor* infers, that at *Rome* there *Epist. Affir. p.*
297. was then (viz. in the beginning of the fourth Age) no preaching but in the Mother Church: (And then not only at *Alexandria*, but at *Rome* in the fourth Age, if the people met not in one place with the Bishop, they could have no Sermon;) and the inference is altogether as just, that there there was no *Eucharist* but at the great Church. So that those places, (call them what you will, *Tituli*, or *Aulpas*, or *Basilicae*,) seem to be but *Oratories*, and not intended or used for celebrating the Lords Supper. And there are more of these in some one of our

^d *Socrat. His.*
Lib. 5. Cap. 21.

Parishes than either at *Alexandria* or *Carthage*, and yet the people not so numerous, but they can and do communicate together.

Pag. 250. to shew that there were more Altars than one where Christians did communicate in a City (or Bishoprick, contrary to what he had asserted in his Sermon) he alledges a passage in the Conference at *Carthage*, where *Fortunatus* objects to *Petilian*, That in the Town where he was Bishop, the *Hereticks* had broken down all the Altars. But this will be no good argument, that there were more Altars for the Eucharist than one in a Town, to those who take notice that in *Africa* there were abundance of Altars for other designs and purposes, than celebrating the Eucharist. Particularly, there were many erected as *Memorie Martyrum*, which appears by the fifth Council at *Carthage*, *Can. 14.* where those Fathers take notice of such Altars in the Fields, the *Ways*, & *ubique*, and *every where*; and some of them they condemn, (viz. those, *In quibus nullum corpus aut reliquie Martyrum condite probantur*,) others they approve.

He shews, that places distant from the City were in the Bishops Diocese, but these will not serve his turn, nor will what is alledged serve for proof. It is a Canon in the African Code, that no Bishop should leave his *Cathedral Church*, and go to any other Church in his Diocese there to reside.

Can. 71. But suppose this *Cathedral Church* was in some Village, it cannot hence be proved that any places distant from a City, were in the Bishop's Diocese, viz. in the Diocese of the City Bishop. And this is no improbable supposition; indeed there's near ten to one for it, since in *Africa* for one Bishop in a City there might be ten in Villages. And none will doubt of this, who know how many hundred Bishops there were.

were in *Africa*, and how few Cities. Their *Cathedral* Churches, (though the sound be big to those who measure them by ours) were all, but a few in comparison, *Village-Cathedrals*; it may be some of our *Chappels of Ease* out-do them.

But it evidently proves that there were more Churches in a Bishops Diocese. And so are there many *Chappels* and some *Churches* too in some one of our Country Parishes. But this will be far from evidently proving any such thing, if the *Canon* be rightly represented; for there it is not *bis Diocese*, either in the *Greek* or *Latine* Copies, but a *Diocese*, and so may either be a Church belonging to another *Bishop*, or a *Diocese* that had no *Bishop*: for *Diocesses* there were in that Country which never had *Bishops*, as appears by the *second Council of Carthage*, where it is decreed *that Dioceses which never had a Bishop, should not have any*.

The word *Diocese*, as it is most frequently used in ancient Writers, denotes that which is either so much *bigger*, or so *far less* than a modern *Diocese*, that he who argues from one to the other, may run into mistakes himself, and lead others with him. In the former acceptation, it contains many Provinces; so *Balsomon* defines it, *οντας πολλας θεσεις*. The whole ^g *Roman Empire* was divided into twelve or thirteen such *Dioceses*, and *Africa* under the *Romans* was but one of them, *Justinian* reducing all the *African* Provinces into one *Diocese*^h. In the latter acceptation it is used for a Country Town or Village, for a Parish or part of a Parish. Thus a *Presbyter* is said *Diocesis tenere*, to *hold a Diocese*, and *Pappolus* is said *Diocesis & villas Ecclesias circumire*ⁱ, where *Dioceses* and *Villages* seem to explain one another, as *Dioceses* and *Parishes* do in another Council^j. So

f Can. 5. Code Afric. Can. 53.

g In Caled. Concil. Can. 17.

h Novel 131.

i Con. Agath. Can. 53, 54.

k Greg. Turon. Lib. 5. Hist. Franc. cap. 5.

l Tolt. 4. Can. 36.

m. Or. 4. Can.
32.

a *Dioceſe* is put for a *Church* or a *Chappel*, which a man erects in his own ground; thus a *Synod* at *Orleans* orders ^m, that when any man hath, or desires to have a *Dioceſe* in his ground, he must allow competent *Land* thereto, and provide a *Clerk* for it. Like these were the *Dioceſes* mentioned in the *African* *Canons*, and their *Bishopricks* were answerable.

It is determined in several *African* *Canons*, that the *Dioceſes* which never had *Bishops*, should have none. But this was decreed upon terms and with exception, if the Christians in those places were multiplied, and they desired a *Bishop* of their own, they were to have one

^mCor. Cart. 2. Can. 5. Code Afric. 53.

^o Code Afric. Can. 55.

^p Perpet. Go- vern. pag. 256. Cap. 13.

^q Can. 6.

Now when the people were numerous enough for this purpose, we may understand by the practice of those *Churches*, there were divers *Bishops* in *Africa* who had but one *Presbyter* belonging to them, as appears by the case which *Posthumianus* puts ^o, of a *Bishop* having but one *Presbyter*. Hence *Bishop Bilton* concludes, that *Bishops* oftentimes had but one *Presbyter* ^p. So that the people were numerous enough to have a *Bishop*, where they were too many for the cure and inspection of one *Presbyter*. And this was the fence not only of the *African* *Churches*, but of the *Eastern* and *Western* also, as appears by the Council of *Sardica*, where the *Bishops* both from *West* and *East* assembled. There those Fathers, more careful than their *Predecessors*, thought needful, left *Bishops* should be disparaged by having their *Chairs* in *small places*, to decree ^q, that *Bishops* shall not be made in *little Towns* or *Villages*, and there explain which they count little; *Cui satis est unus Presbyter*, such as one *Presbyter* is sufficient for. But they add, where the *People* are numerous, (viz. So as one *Presbyter* will not suffice, as the contexture shews,) desiring a *Bishop*,

bishop, let them have one. So that it was the sense of the ancient Church, both in *Africa*, *Europe* and *Asia*, that in any place where there were so many Christians, as that a Presbyter needed an *Assistant*, there a Bishop ought to be placed. By this we may discern whether or no their Bishopricks were like our Parishes, especially considering that they thought it requisite to multiply Presbyters far more than we do now; and judged too, that one of them was not sufficient for so numerous a Flock as one hath now in charge. Their great number of Presbyters in many places shews this. To go no farther than *Carthage*, were the *Dr.* finds but *eight Churches* great and small, yet the *Clergy* were above five hundred; so many belonging to *Carthage* were banished by *Hunnericus*, as *Victor* tells us^{1.} *Jerome* saith, the Presbyters were multiplied so excessively, that *they became contemptible*; *Presbyteros turba contemptibiles facit*^{2.}

¹ *De Persecut.*
Vandal. Lib. 1.

² *Epist. ad Evag.*

‘And where the *Donatists* had erected new Bishopricks, the *African* Council decrees that after ‘the decease of such Bishop, if the people had no ‘mind to have another in his room, they might be ‘in the Diocese of another Bishop: which shews ‘that they thought the Dioceses might be so large ‘as to hold the people that were under two Bishops,
‘p. 250.

It was most common in *Africa* to have Bishops in Villages, and ordinary for the *Donatists* to have a Bishop in the same place where the *Catholicks* had one; which shews, that they thought, that the Diocese need be no larger, than that a Village might hold the People that were under two Bishops. The *Catholicks* decree, that when a *Donatist* Bishop was deceased, if the reduced people would have another in his place, they were to have one without consulting a Council.

³ *Code Africa.*
Cat. 99.

‘There

There were many Canons made about the People of the *Donatist* Bishops. In one it was determined, that they should belong to the Bishop that converted them, &c. After that, that they should belong to the same Diocese they were in before.

But if the converted People desired to have a Bishop of their own, as they had before, then they were to belong to neither, as appears by several Canons. So that in this case, *African* Bishops might be as numerous, and consequently as small, after the *Donatists* were reduced, as before; and so far enough from any resemblance of modern *Diocesans*, and as like our *Parishes* as *Mr. B.* would have them.

But if the *Donatist* Bishop were converted, the Diocese was to be divided between them, *pag. 251.*

Thus in a City, when there was both a *Catholick* and a *Donatist* Bishop (than which nothing was more ordinary) if the *Donatist* was converted, the Town must be divided between them; and two Bishops were to be continued in one City. In some places there were four Bishops of one Party, for one of the other. *Verissimus* Bishop at *Tacara* saith, *in his flock there were four other Bishops, Batianus, Aspidius, Fortunatus and Octavianus* *.

* *Collat. Carth.* *D. 1. N. 121.* Suppose where there were four *Donatist* Bishops, they had all been converted, the place by this Rule must have been divided amongst five Bishops.

And so in a Village where there were two Bishops, as there was at *Mutuzena*, (and many other such places in *Africa* ^x), the *Donatist* Bishop being converted, the Village was to be divided between them into two Dioceses, and each Diocese there had been no more than half a Parish with us. *Mr. B.* will not be much against such *Diocesans*, nor troubled at any such proofs out of antiquity for *Diocesans* of another kind.

x Ibid. N. 133.
& N. 207.

He passes to *Hippo*, and in the Countrey about it finds divers Presbyters and Deacons, whereby he would prove the *largeness* of that Dioceſe. But he might there have found divers Bishops also. That there were more Bishops in the Countrey which he would appropriate to St. *Austins* jurisdiction, may appear by those very instances which the Dr. makes use of to shew, that he was the only Bishop there, and the Presbyters and Deacons in those places, all *under his care and government*.

Fussala is one of them, and this is acknowledged to have had a Bishop, though it was but a *Castle*, and so called more than once in the place cited. The realon why it had a Bishop no sooner, is signified by *Austin*, when he saith, there were *no Catholicks at all in it*; *In eodem Castello nullus esset omnino Catholicus*; but multitudes of *Donarists*. Yet when ſome were gained to the Church there, or in the parts about it, a Bishoprick was erected in it for the Catholicks. The place being remote from *Hippo*, *Austin* was ſensible that the charge was too great for him, *extending further than it ought, and discerning that he was not ſufficient for the diligence which in all reaſon was due to it*, he took care that a Bishop ſhould be ordained, and placed there: *Me viderem latius quam oportebat extendi, nec adhibenda ſufficere diligencie, quam certissima ratione adhiberi debere cernebam*.

But the Dr. ſayes, he was fain to resume it. What he understands thereby, I don't well know, but if any thing be meant for his purpose, it muſt be that this Bishoprick was extinguished. But there's no ground for this. It's true *Antonius*, made Bishop there, was upon ſome complaints put out of *Fussala*, yet ſalvo *Episcopatu*, ſo as he retained the Epifcopal dignity; but the place was not deprived of the Epifcopal Chair,

Chair, for though it might continue void for sometime, yet a Bishop is found there afterwards in the *African Notitia, Melior Fussalensis* is reckoned amongst the Bishops of *Numidia*. Hereby it is manifest that this holy Bishop could not digest so great a Diocese as the Dr. assigns him. He had the wisdom and humility to think himself not *sufficient* for a Charge so remote and extended; and he had the conscience not to charge himself with that which he was not *sufficient* for. So when *Fussala* had a competent Number of persons in it of their communion, he takes care (which was the general practice of the *African Bishops*) to form a Bishoprick in that *Castle*, and such a Diocese, as so small a place and some other near it could make. And this about *Anno, 420.* when the generality of the people tainted with *Donatism* was reduced, and Laws made for the banishment of their Bishops and Clergy, and the delivery of their Churches to the Catholicks; and so, when it cannot be pretended that this Schism was the *occasion* of a further *multiplication of Bishops*.

It appears that a place forty Miles distant, was then under the care of so great a Saint, and so excellent a Bishop, as *Austin* was.

It was under his care, not as one that intended to be their Pastor, or as a fixed part of his Bishoprick, as places are which belong to one of our Dioceses; but only to make them capable of having a Pastor, and to have one placed amongst them, as the event makes it evident. Hereby it appears that the Dr. might have forborn his *Queries*. We need not *guess* what answer St. *Austin* would have returned to them, he has done it actually in this Epistle, though it may be not to the Dr's Satisfaction. For the numbers at *Fussala*, he sayes, at first there was

not one Catholick, afterward there were but few, when there was more they had a Bishop of their own. And for taking upon him the care of so distant a place, he saies he was not sufficient for it himself, the care he took was to have it committed to another. So that Mr. B. sees no reason to tell *Austin*, that he understood not the right constitution of Churches; but he may see reason to tell others so, and thank St. *Austin* for here discovering it. I might have alledged, that this Epistle which the Dr. makes such use of, is suspected by learned men, as is noted in the last Edition of *Austin's Epistles at Paris*. It is not found in the anciencer and less suspected Editions. The *Papists* (from whom we have it) are concerned for the credit of it. It helps them to an argument for the Bishop of *Romes* power about *Appeals* from foreign parts. For *Antonius* Bishop of *Fussala*, being censured in *Africa*, appealed (it's said,) to *Celestinus* Bishop of *Rome*, to whom this Epistle is directed. But then it seems not likely that *Antonius* should have the confidence to do this, when the *African* Fathers had so positively declared against such *Appeals*; and *Apianus* a little before had found the like attempt so unsuccessfull. Nor is it probable, that St. *Austin* fortified with the Decrees of the *African* Councils, would be so much concerned (as this Epistle would make him) to hinder *Calestinus* from revoking the Sentence, which all the Authority of *Africa* had made irreovcable by any Bishop of *Rome*. But there's no need to insist on this, whether it be supposititious or not, we have offer'd enough to render it unserviceable to the Dr's design.

Another place he mentions for the said purpose, is *Municipium Tullense*, or *Tulliense*, as some Editions have it. I meet with *Episcopatus Tullensis* in a Catalogue

atalogue of *African* Bishops. It may be that denotes this very place; the variation of one letter need not hinder, since it is so common with the *African* writers to vary so much and more, in the naming of their Towns. Instances hereof might be given in abundance, take but this one. *Donatianus* a Bishop in the Province of *Byzacena*, is styled from his Bishoprick *Telepiensis* in one Council^y, *Teleptensis* elsewhere^z; with the change of the same letter that is in the instance before us. Whether it be so or not, there's no doubt but if this Town was stored with Christians, it had a Bishop of its own, for it is scarce credible that when so many contemptible Villages in that Countrey had their Bishops, there should be none in so considerable a *Corporation* as this, which as appears by *Austin's* description of *Murca* the sick person, had its *Duum-virate*, and *Common-Council*, answerable to the *Consuls* and *Senate* at *Rome*, and was honoured with the Priviledges and immunities of the Imperial City.

However *Austin* doth not say that this Town had *Presbyter* and *Clerks* under his care and government. This is added without any ground that I can discern in the place cited, and without this addition the particular story which the Dr. recites does him not the least service.

Nor does St. *Austin* say to *Cecilian* the President, that he was Bishop of that Diocese (which the Dr. represents as a Region of large extent,) but only that he had *Episcopalem Sartinam Hipponensem*, the *Episcopal charge of Hippo*^a.

The third Town which he speaks of as in *Austin's* Diocese, is *Mutigena*, or *Murigena*. But this also had its own Bishop, or two for a need. In the conference at *Carthage* there is *Antonius Episcopus Mutigenensis* for

^y *Milevit Can.*

^z *17.*

^z *Collat. Carth.*

^z *1.*

^z *1.</i*

for the Catholicks, and *Splendonus* Bishop there for the *Donatists*^b. And thus it was even in *Hippo* it self, ^{b D. 1. N. 133.} ^{& N. 207.} *Austin* was Bishop there for the Catholicks, and *Macrobius* for the *Donatists*, who succeeded *Proculeianus* in the Chair there^c. So that *Austin* is so far from having ^{d Ibid. N. 138.} ^{N. 201. Ep. 88.} ^{N. 8.} *all the Region* under his Jurisdiction (this being parted amongst several other Bishops) that he had not the *whole Town*, the *Donatists* had a *Dioceſe* there, such a one as those in *Africa* used to be, where one little Town (and *Hippo* was none of the greatest) would serve for two *Dioceſes*. And in some places where the *Donatists* had one Bishop, the Catholicks would have four: And they were served in the same kind by the *Donatists*, who in other places had three or four for their one, of which there are several instances in that famous *conference at Carthage*^d. ^{d N. 107. 121.} ^{65. 198.}

Other Towns might be added which had Bishops of their own in that Region, but there's no need of more. St. *Austin* himself signifies plainly that there were more Bishops in the Territory of *Hippo*, when he moved *Jannarius* the *Primate* of the *Donatists*, that they would meet together with the Catholick Bishops, that were in that Territory, and who there suffered so much by the *Donatists*^e. *Ecce interim Episcopos nostros qui sunt in Regione Hipponeſi ubi à vestris tanta mala patimur convenite.* ^{e Ep. 68.}

If the Region of *Hippo* was so very large as the Dr. represents it, there is no doubt but there were many good Villages in it. And Mr. *Thornalike* (whom none can suspect to be partial this way, his *Byass* rather leading him the other) tells us, That in *Africa*, Bishops were so plentiful, that every good Village must needs be the Seat of an *Episcopal Church*^f. And if, as the Dr. says, the notorious Schism of the *Donatists* was the occasion of the multiplication of Bishops in *Africa*, ^{f Right of Churches review, pag. 53.} they

they must be most multipliyed in *Numidia*, to which *Hippo* belonged ; because the *Donatists* were there most numerous. He that finds betwixt an hundred and two hundred Bishops in the Province of *Numidia*, and makes the Region of *Hippo* of more than forty miles extent, yet offers to prove there was but one Bishop in that Region ; need not despair but he may make any thing probable.

After such plain Evidence of the extent of *Dioceses*, he would bring as clear proof of *Metropolitans Provinces* in the *African* Churches. To me they are both clear alike, who can discern nothing of Evidence in them. His proof is meerly *Cyprians* calling that part of *Africa* where he lived, *Provincia nostris*, two or three times. Before *Ecclesiastical Metropolitans* were known in the World, *Africa* was by the *Romans* di-vided into *Provinces*, as our Kingdom hath been long into *Counties*. Cannot one that lives in an English *Shire*, call it *our County*, but that must be a clear proof that he is the *Governour* of it ? *Cyprian* himself never dreamt of any such thing. He disclaims all Au-thority over the Bishops of that or any other *Province*, *Neque enim quisquam nostrum Episcopum se esse Episcoporum*

^x *In cito. Cart. constituit x.* The great *Causabon*, where he was concern'd to speak as favourably of the *English Constitution* as possibly could be, sayes, *It is most manifest that this Superiority was of humane Constitution, and in the first and second Ages, and a great part of the third, not known in the Church y.* And D. St. elsewhere tells us, *there was no difference as to the power of the Bishops themselves, who had all equal Authority in their several Churches, and none over another.*

^y *Exercit. 16.* ^{pag. 533.} *And* D. St. elsewhere tells us, *there was no difference as to the power of the Bishops themselves, who had all equal Authority in their several Churches, and none over another.* He not only sayes this, but brings for it ^z *clear proof indeed*^z, and finds no higher rise of *Metropolitical Power or Priviledge*, than the Council at *Antioch*, near an hundred years after. The great

Privil-

^z *In. pag. 370*

but declare, that the Bishop of the first Seat should not be called the Exarch of the Priests, or chief Priest, or any thing of like nature; but only the Bishop of the first Seat. Hence Dr. St. concludes, Therefore it hath been well observed, that the African Churches did retain longest the Primitive simplicity and humility among them, and when the Voice was said to be heard in the Church upon the flowing in of Riches, *Hodie venenum effusum est in Ecclesiam*, by the working of which Poyson the Spirits of the Prelates began to swell with Pride and Ambition, as is evident in Church History; only Africa escaped the infection most, &c. So that however Africa hath been alwayes fruitful of Monsters, yet in that Ambitious Age, it had no other wonder but only this, that it should escape so free from that *Typhus Secularis*, (as they then call'd it,) that *Monstrous Itch of Pride and Ambition*.

¶ I. m. p. 373.

Victor mentions one Crescens, who had One hundred and Twenty Bishops under him as Metropolitan, p. 253.

Under him; how? as one over whom he had jurisdiction, or to whom they swore Canonical Obedience? No such thing; but under him as an honorary President in their Assemblies; who there could do nothing without them as to any matters of moment, but was still to be concluded by their Votes, he having neither negative nor casting voice. Such a Moderator he was as the reformed Churches have in their Synods or other assemblies; only he after the fourth Age held the place and honour for life, as theirs alwayes do not. But this makes no material difference, if Grotius mistake not, who saies, it is not *de re*, but *de habendi modo*. A Dictator made but for the dispatch of some present difficulty, was as much a King (in his account) as he that reigned during life.

g De jure Belli.

L. 1. c. 3. Sect. 11.

Duratio naturam rei non immutat &c.

Sect.

Secc. 10. He passes to *Egypt*, and from what *Athanasius* says of *Marcotis*, he draws several Observations, which seem not all current. He observes, 1. That here were true *Parochial Churches*, because they are called Churches: but so were the *Tisuli* at *Rome* called, yet were not better than *Oratories* (or *Chapels* of *Ease* in many of our Parishes) where all divine Offices were not performed. That they were all performed there, so as the people were not sometimes obliged to have recourse to *Alexandria* for some, one *Athanasius* doth not intimate, nor the Dr. affirm. He observes also *that they were so under the Bishop, as that he had the whole Government*. But if he had the whole, those Presbyters had none of it; and then he was such a Bishop, and they such Presbyters as that age did not know. This the best *Affessor* of *Episcopacy* acknowledge, and Dr. St. hath proved. *He observes that they were at that distance, that they could not have local Communion with their Bishop at Alexandria.* But that the Distance was not such, as to hinder them from having communion with their Bishop, is evident by an Epistle of *Dionysius*, who being banished to *Cephro*, and troubled that afterwards the Governour would remove him to *Colushion* in *Marcotis*; the Brethren encourage him because, this was so near *Alexandria*, that it might be reputed but a remoter *Suburbs*, *as in τοποῖς*; and though the place was destitute of Christians, yet those of *Alexandria* might frequently have recourse to them, and make up a Congregation h.

But further, not to insist more upon his Observations but the Scope of them, if *Marcotis* was well replenished with Christians when *Athanasius* was made Bishop there, it had not been long so; for *Dionysius* in his time, declares it to be, a *desert* as to *Christians* or *any good men*, *ἴπητον ἀληθῶν καταδιωκόμενον* i. *It is*

h Epist. 1. 7. 7.

ii.

It was the fence of the Church, (as I shew'd before,) that where Christians were so multiplied in any place, as to need more than one Presbyter; and they desir'd to have a Bishop, it was not to be denied them. If this was now the condition of *Markosius*, *Athanasius* would not have hinder'd them from having a Bishop: but indeed his Adversaries were too quick for him, and made *Ishyras* Bishop in *Markosius*¹. It is true, *Athanasius* was troubled at it, because *Ishyras* was a very bad man, and had this honour as the reward of an ill act; but not because it lessen'd his *Diocese*, or impaired his *Revenues*, (though Countrey *Oblations*, upon which with those of the City, the Bishop and Clergy lived; being withdrawn from the City were allowed to the Countrey Bishop, where a new Bishoprick was erected:) For he was well enough pleased with others that were deserving in the same Circumstances, particularly with *Dracorius* who was made Bishop in the same Territory of *Alexandria*,
 1 *Epist. ad Dra-*
 cont.
 in *Alexandriam* *regem*. And more there might be, for in those Parts as in others, Bishops were seated as little distant one from another, as Countrey Towns are with us. To go no further than the Countrey bordering upon this, in *Palestine*, *Diospolis* or *Lydda* an Episcopal Seat, was but Six Miles from *Joppa*, and *Joppa* some Four Miles from *Jamnia*; *Rhinocorura* four Miles from *Anthodon*; and *Anthodon* not Three Miles (so *Sozomen* fayes about Twenty Furlongs^m) from *Gaza*; and *Gaza* Twenty Furlongs from *Constantia* (antiently *Maizuma*ⁿ.) *Strabo* makes it little more than *Seaven Furlongs*^o. In *Egypt* it self, the Cities, (though there were Bishops also in the Countrey) were close together. *Nicopolis* was Twenty Furlongs from *Alexandria*, as *Josephus* p. or *Thirty Furlongs*^p

^m *Hist. Lib. 5. cap. 8.*

ⁿ *Sor. ibid.*

^o *p. 336.*

^o *Lib. 16.*

^p *p. 522.*

^p *De Bello Ju-*

^{daic. Lib. 5. c.}

^{nt. q Lib. 17.}

^p *p. 593.*

as *Strabo*, and *Tapofiris* (near *Nicopolis*,) and *Canopus*, *Heraclia*, and *Naukratis* not much further one from another.⁵⁹³ More Instances hereof might be given in other Countreys, *Syria*, the lesser *Asia*, *Greece*, *Macedon*, and *Italy*, where there are divers Cities but two Miles distant, very many at three or four Miles distance, abundance at five or six; I must not digress to give a particular account of them. Those who ordained every such City or Town to have a Bishop, were far from designing any such things as modern Dioceses.

“But *M. B.*’s great argument is, from the meeting of the whole multitude with *Athanasius* in the great Church at *Alexandria*, to keep the Easter solemnity, p. 254.

And there is some weight in it, because nothing considerable can be said against it. It amounts to more than is said, if a just account be taken of it. He tells the Emperour there were *noīn*, so many Christians at the Paschal Solemnity, as a Prince that loved Christ, would wish to be in the City, and that these desired to meet in the great Church, that they all might pray there, *καὶ νῦν ἐν Χριστῷ*, and so they did, *καὶ νῦν*. Can this signify any less, than that all the Christians in that City which adhered to *Athanasius*, did meet and pray in one place? He sayes, that one place was capable of receiving them all, *καὶ νῦν*. He saies the multitudes there met, were such as at other times assembled in several other little places, *καὶ ἔχειν, &c.* How (sayes he) did the people rejoice to see one another now, when before they met in several places? Let any one view the whole passage, and I doubt not, it will be plain to any impartial eye, that the main Body of Christians, belonging to *Athanasius*, did meet in that one Church. But by this I see nothing will

be plain in *Antiquity*, to him that likes it not. Hereby the Dr's following questions are answ'red, p. 255.

It is no good argument, that because all the Christians in *London* can't meet in *Pauls*, therefore all the Christians adhering to *Athanasius* in *Alexandria* could not meet in a *great Church*. *Alexandria* was never, by far, so populous as *London*, much less at this time. The greatest part of the Inhabitants of that City were at this time *Heathens* or *Jews*. Of those who passed for *Christians*, it is like *Athanasius* had the lesser share. The *Novatians* and other *Setts*, the *Meletians* especially, and the *Arians*, did probably exceed his *flock* in numbers. It may be the *Arians* alone were more numerous, considering how many they were there at *first*, and what encouragements and advantages they had under such an *Emperour* as *Constantius*; and therefore these Cities are vastly different, in that very thing wherein they should agree, to make such reasoning good, either for proof or illustration. After this time *Epiphanius* mentions about *twelve* Meeting places in *Alexandria*; whether there were so many now, or whether the *Catholicks* had them all, may be a Question. However *Athanasius* tells us, that all thele *save one* were exceeding small, *very short and strait places*, *νον πολλον οργανων οργανων των*. And after, he sayes, they were *υπερ της στρατης*. There are as many or more Churches and Chappels, (it's like as great as those in *Alexandria*,) in some one of our Parishes in *England*, the Parishioners assemble in the lesser places at other times, but at some *Solemnities* they are wont to communicate at the chief *Parish Church*. Will any argue from such *Parishes* for our *Dioceses*, or that they could not meet in one place, because they had so many other little places to meet in?

There's,

¹ *Apol.* p. 531.

² *P.* 532.

Theres's no need for the serving *M. B's Hypothesis*, that *Alexandria* be shrunk into a less compass, nor doth *M. B.* in the least attempt it. He gives the full dimensions of that City out of *Strabo*, as grave and judicious a *Geographer*, and every way as unexceptionable, as any he could pitch on; who is so far from lessening it, that he calls it, *μεγαλη πόλις Ευρυτερία, the greatest Mart Town in the World.* Yet he might have told us that, *Ausonius* makes it inferior to *Constantinople*, to *Antiochia* and to *Carthage*, ^{t De ord. Nob. Urb.} who may pass for as judicious an Author as he that will have it *ανώνυμος, incomprehensibly* great. But he detracting nothing from the greatness of that City, offers as fair probabilities, that the Christians in it joyning with *Athanasius*, might all meet in one place, as can be expected in such a case^u; But the *Dr.* ^{u Church. Hist. p. 9, 10.} thought not fit to take notice of them.

"To shew the great number of Christians in " *Alexandria*, he tells us, pag. 255, 256. long before " the time of *Athanasius*, *Dionysius Alexandrinus* faith, " in a time of great persecution when he was ba- " nished, he kept up the Assemblies in the City, and " at *Cephro* he had a large Church, partly of the Christi- " ans of *Alexandria* which followed him, and partly " from other places; and when he was removed " thence to *Colluthion*, which was nearer the City, such " numbers of Christians flocked out of the City to " him, that they were forced to have distinct Congre- " gations, so the words *κατα μέρας* signifie.

Cephro was a place in *Lybia*, at a great distance from *Alexandria*; in the Epistle cited it is a *Village near the Desert*, and that was no place for very great Assemblies; that which increased it, was the recourse of Christians from some other parts of *Egypt*. However it was greater than what they had or expected,

when removed to *Marcotis*, though so very near to *Alexandria*, as *Dionysius* his friends there signified. But to encourage him, they tell him, *as it afterwards fell out*, that their Meetings though *not so great*, might be more frequent, Christians still coming to them from *Alexandria*, one company after another; so that they might often have Assemblies for Worship and Christian Communion at *Colluthion*, though in less numbers than at *Cephro*; and that by the contexture of the discourse seems to be the meaning of *κατὰ μέρη*, their assembling in parcels as they came, some at one time, and others at another; not that such numbers flockt thither at once out of the City, as that they were forced to have distinct Congregations. Indeed a company not very numerous, might be well thought too many for one Assembly in their circumstances, in the Paroxism of a violent persecution, when *Aelianus* the Goverour, passing Sentence of banishment on them, told them, *It should be death to keep a meeting in the place to which they were banished*, and that they should be *narrowly watched* in order to a discovery: And *Dionysius* sayes, he was on purpose disposed of in such a place, where he might *most easily be apprehended*. And therefore if they had met in distinct Congregations at the same time, this had been no argument to prove them so numerous as the Dr. is concerned to have them. Less than a thousand, yea, or five hundred will more than satisfie the import of any passage in this *Epistle*, which he makes use of to prove the great numbers of Christians in that City. However, as if his supposition had been proved, he proceeds upon it thus: “If there were such a number of Christians at *Alexandria*, so long before, under the sharpest persecution, is it possible to imagine in so great a City after Christianity had so long been the Religion

“ligion of the Empire, that the number of Christi-
“ans there should be no greater than to make one
“large Congregation? p. 256.

The Professors of *Christianity* greatly increased after this became the *Religion* of the *Empire*; but the greatest part of those who professed it, did not adhere to *Athanasius*; both the *Meletians* and the *Arians* fell off from his Predecessors, and the breach continued all his time; so that the *Catholicks* in *Alexandria* seem not to have gained much more by the happy alteration in the *Empire*, than they lost by those unhappy *divisions*. At the first breach, *Meletius* had many more Adherents than *Peter*, as *Epi-*
phanius tells us ^{*}, *far most of the Bishops, Clergy and*
People deserting *Peter* and cleaving to *Meletius*. *Con-*
stantine granted them the liberty of their Meetings, and *Athanasius* who opposed them, was by him Ba-
nished, and so continued many years, (twelve or
thirteen) under such encouragements as they had under him and *Constantius*, their numbers were not like to be impaired.

As for the *Arians*, if we may take our measures of the People by their Officers, they were more nu-
merous than the *Catholicks* in this City; for of *nine*
Presbyters and Deacons which the Church of *Alexan-*
dria had, as *Theodoret* reckons ^x, *eleven* embraced *Aria-*
nism ^y. *Constantine*, if he did not favour them,
would not oppose them, but was severe against those
that did; against *Athanasius* particularly. *Constantius*,
his Successor in those parts of the *Empire*, was both
Zealous and Industrious in promoting *Arianism*. In
these circumstances the *Arians* might well out-vie
the followers of *Athanasius* in numbers; and these
declined as the other increased; the numbers which
these lost, being gained by those. *Alexander*, his im-
mediate

^{* Her. 58. m. 3.}

^x Hif. 1. 4. t.

^y 20.

^y Soz. 1. 1. t.

^{14.}

mediate Predecessor, assembled the main body of his Adherents in *Theonas*, a Church not quite finished, ^{Athanas. Ibid.} [as *Athanasius* did afterwards in another, and pleads it in excuse of his own Act;] this Church is reckoned among the other Churches that were *small* and *strait*, though something greater than the rest. Now is it probable that the *Catholicks* there should be so much increased, upon such revolts and under such discouragements, as that those who could meet together in an *ordinary* Church with *Alexander*, should be too many to assemble in a *very great* Church with *Athanasius*? Let the impartial judge who they are that *build Theories upon strange improbabilities*.

The Dr. proceeds, to what he thinks *plain enough of it self to shew the great extent of Diocesan Power*, it is that of *Theodorets*, where 'tis said he had the charge of eighty Churces^z.

This might be dismissed, as out of the bounds we are concern'd for, being beyond not only the three first, but the fourth Age: for this Epistle, if it be *Theodorets*, was writ about the middle of the fifth Age, when all was tumbling into confusion and degeneracy; Only thus in brief. The passage insisted on runs thus: *In eighty Churches I have been Pastor, for so many Parishes hath Cyrrhus.* *Cyrrhus* here is but capable of three acceptions; it must be taken either for the City alone; or both for the City and the Region; or for the Region alone without the City. Against this *last*, there is an unanswerable exception, the word is never thus used in these Epistles or elsewhere. Nor I think can an instance be given where the proper name of a City, as *Cyrrhus* was, signifies the Countrey alone, and not the City it self. The *second* the Dr. rejects, and is concerned so to do, seeing if he admitted it, it would entangle him in a difficulty

difficulty that seems inextricable. If the *first* be admitted, it must be granted that *Theodoret* was not the Author of this Epistle, or at least of the passage insisted on, as here exprested. For he who described *Cyrrhus* to be a *desolate place*, *τεποντικη χωρα*, *having few inhabitants, and those poor*^a, ^{a Epist. 32.} and elsewhere mentions *τεποντικη χωρα*, signifying it to be a *small Town in a manner desolate*^b, ^{b Epist. 138.} would neither say nor dream, that there were *eighty Parishes in it*. But there's no need to insist on this or other probabilities, that this Epistle is spurious, or this passage corrupted. That which the *Dr.* delivers in his discourse upon it, is enough to shew, that it will not serve his design, nor is pertinent to the Scope he proposes. He tells us *in that Province* (called *Regio Cyrrhestica*) *there was a Metropolitan of Hagiopolis, which by the ancient Notitiae, appears to have been then, one of the names of Cyrus or Cyrrhus*, p. 258.

If this be so, then *Theodoret* must be a *Metropolitan*, and himself seems to signify no less, when he tells us he ordained *Irenaeus* a Bishop^c. For though others were wont to concur with the *Metropolitan* in ordaining a Bishop, yet the act is still ascribed to the *Metropolitan* (being chief therein,) as if he alone did it. So that when but *one Ordainer* of a Bishop is mentioned, regularly, that *one* must be taken for a *Metropolitan*. He tells us also, that the reason of his Confinement, alledged in the Imperial Order for that purpose was, because he was *still convocating Synods*^d, and that in those times is taken to be the priviledge of a *Metropolitan*. But there needs no other proof of it; for since it is plain by the *Notitiae*, and acknowledged by the *Dr.* that *Cyrus* was a *Metropolis*, none will question but the *Bishop* of it was a *Metropolitan*. And if *Theodoret* was a *Metropolitan*

Concilia d
Epist. 79, 80.
81, 82.
Council Antioch
Cap. 19, 20.

tropolitam, these eighty Churches will shew not the extent of *Diocean*, but *Metropolitan* Power. None ever doubted but *Theodoret* was Bishop of this City *Cyrus*, he himself declares it plainly and frequently. It's said, he was confined to *Cyrus* being Bishop of that City^c, and that he was confined to his own home by the Emperours Law, forbidding him to go out of the bounds of that City^f. He sayes, this City was committed to his charge^g, τῷ ἐγκαρδίᾳ τοῦ πόλεων, and since he was the Bishop of the City *Cyrus*, that being a *Metropolis*, *Theodoret* must be the *Metropolitan*. For if he was only Bishop there, but another and not he there *Metropolitan*, there will be two Bishops in that City; which must in no case be admitted against the Dr's inviolable rule.

How this will be avoided I know not. But the Dr. will have the eighty Churches to be in *Theodoret's* *Dioceſe*; and why so? Because *Theodoret* mentions the *Metropolitan* he was under. But so might any other *Metropolitan* in those parts do, without danger of losing his Province. For all the *Metropolitans* in the *Dioceſe* of the *Orient* (wherein, according to the *Notitiae* of the *Empire*, there are fifteen Provinces, but by the *Ecclesiastical Notitiae* many more *Metropolitans* and Arch-bishops, though divers of them pass as *autocephalous*) were under him of *Antioch*, which City *Jerome* calls the *Metropolis of the Orient*; Ut *Paleſtine Metropolis Cefarea sit, & totius Orientis Antiochia*^h, & *Zozimus*ⁱ, mons n. *Edas* περιβολαις *Theodoret* sayes (that having ruled that Church committed to him at *Cyrus* twenty six years^k) he had Preached

^h *Advers. Job. Hierosol.*
ⁱ *Hist. Lib. 1.*
^k *Epif. 113.* six years under *Theodosius* Bishop of *Antioch*; thirteen years under *John*; and it was now the seventh year since *Domnus* was Arch-bishop there^l. But that he was under any other *Metropolitan* of *Cyrus* (or elsewhere)

where he never fayes nor intimates, and when the Dr. has inquired fully into it, I doubt not but he will find it a groundless imagination.

Since *Cyrrhus* is acknowledged to be a *Metropolis*, and thereupon it can no way be denied, but *Theodore* the Bishop of it was a *Metropolitan*; this might be improved further for our *Author's* satisfaction, if we could know certainly how many Bishops were in this *Province*: but for any thing I can yet discover, we must be content with conjectures. The Dr. tells us from *Victor*, that *Crescens* had *one hundred and twenty Bishops* in his *Province*: in that of *Zengitana* it is said there was *one hundred sixty four Bishops*, afterwards reduced to *three*, by the severities of *Gensericus* the *Vandal*^m. In other *African Provinces* there must be as many or more, to make up^{m Victor. de per. s. Vandal. Lib. 1.} the account we have of the many hundred Bishops in *Africa*. If the Bishops under the *Metropolitan of Cyrus*, were so many as in one of these Provinces, and these eight hundred Churches distributed amongst them, the share of each Bishop would scarce be more than some one of our Parishes. Or if the Bishops there were supposed to be fewer, yet would their Bishopricks be more like some *Parishes*, than *modern Dioceses*.

“By *Cyrus* therefore we understand the Region about the City, which was under *Theodore's* care.

He means the Region, and not the City. But I suppose none else will see any reason so to understand it, since it cannot be found, that *Cyrus* is ever any where else so understood: Nor that the name of any other City doth signify the Countrey and not the City. It is as if it should be said, by *London* we understand *Essex*, but not the *City of London*. *Cyrus* was the proper Name of the City (as some think, because

it was built by *Cyrus*, and it's call'd by others *Cyropolis*) but the Countrey about it had another Name, and call'd by *Theodore Cyrrhestica Regio*ⁿ, as the Dr. himself observes: Besides, this makes *Theodore*, not to have been Bishop of the City *Cyrus*, but only of the Region about it, which contradicts *Theodore* in many plain Passages, wherein he declares exprefly that he was Bishop of that City. Of which before.

Theodore himself sets down the Extent of it, 'wherein he fayes it was Forty Miles in length, 'and Forty in breadth.

But how doth it appear that this was the Extent of *Theodore's Diocese*, and not of the *Province*? That's it which is Questioned, and should have been proved. Seeing there were many considerable Cities in that Province, if each of them had a Diocese of such Dimensions (and no Reason to think that *Cyrus* exceeded them herein) this one Province will be far larger than all *Syria* besides.

'He saith in another Epistle, that Christianity was 'then so much spread among them, &c.

What he fayes concerning the spread of Christianity, respects not that *Region* peculiarly, but concerns the *Christian World*, (as will appear to those that view it) though whether it do or no, is not Material. That which he seems to think of more consequence for the overthrowing of Mr. B.'s *Hypothesis*, he thus delivers. 'That these Villages had Churches 'and Priests settled in them under the care of the Bishop, 'appears from a passage in the Life of *Simeon*, where he 'speaks of *Bassus* visiting the Parochial Churches, &c.

Theodore speaks not of *Bassus* visiting Parochial Churches, but Villages: his Words are, *He then Perambulated many Villages, inspecting the Sacred Persons (or Priests) there.* *Bassus*, the Visitor who made this Peram-

Perambulation, was a *Monastick*, and a *Rector* of Monks. *Theodoret* in the same place tell's us, his *Sodality* consisted of above two Hundred, which he calls his *proper Flock*, *ουτις αγάπην*, and gives an Account of the *Rules* he prescribed. But suppose *Bassus* was a Bishop, either these Villages which he Perambulated were in *Theodoret's* Dioceſe, or no. If they were in his Dioceſe, then was there more than one Bishop in one Dioceſe. If they were not in it, how does this serve in the least to prove the Extent of *Theodore's* Dioceſe, which he is here designing to manifest? Nor will this prove *Bassus* to have been a *Dioceſan*, where ever those Villages were which he viſited. There are *Rectors* in *England*, who have many Villages in their Parishes, and *Presbyters* in them, whom they may viſit when they please, yet none take them to be *Dioceſans*.

“He faith he had brought Ten Thousand *Marcionists* to Baptism.

It is, as he expresses it, *more than Ten Thousands*, but this in all Reason must be taken indefinitely, *for very many*, ſeeing in his Epiftle to *Leo*, it is but *τάκις ἡ χαλας more than a Thousand*. And this is more ^{o Epift. 113.} like to be the Number in *Eight Villages* (which being tainted with the Heretie of *Marcion*, he reduced to the Truth ^p) than *many Myriads*; unless he will ^{p Epift. 11.} have each Village to be more Populous, than the Mother City it ſelf. However *Theodoret* doth not ſay that *these Eight Villages were in his Dioceſe*; and he might think himſelf concern'd to reduce them, though they were but in his *Province*.

“And we find the Names of many of the Villages in his Lives, as *Tillima*, &c. Which are ſufficient to ſhew that *Theodoret* had properly a *Dioceſan Church*, &c.

It doth not appear in the places cited that all these five were in his Diocese, but if there had been more than these five, or more than the *eight* forementioned, it would not be *sufficient* to shew that *Theodore* had *properly* a *Diocesan Church*, unless there be *sufficient* in several of our Country Parishes (containing as many Villages,) to shew that they are *properly Diocesan Churches*. Some other Writings than *Theodore*'s *Epistles* or *Lives* must be made use of, if he hopes to make good a *Diocesan Episcopacy*, like ours, in the ancient Church.

The other point, wherein the *Dr.* makes use of *ancient Authorities*, is about *popular Elections*. He seems willing to maintain, that the people in the *ancient Church*, had not the power to *choose* their own Bishops, but only to *give testimony of their good or bad lives*. I was something surprized at this undertaking, and having seen so clear and full evidence for the peoples privilege herein, as hath convinced many learned *Papists* and others, whose interest swayed them the other way; I was ready to think, that those who would contradict it, might be suspected, either to want acquaintance with the *ancient Records* and usages of the Church, or fidelity in reporting them. The *learned and ingenuous Dr.* is not to be suspected as to either of these: only persons of singular learning and other accomplishments, may venture sometimes to defend a *Paradox* and run against the Stream; and if they can with *cogent arguments*, detect a vulgar error, the more common it is, the more excellent service will they do. But if they bring only *straws* against a *Torrent*, or shew themselves resolved to serve a particular Interest, rather than to use impartial judgment, and yield to evidence; though they may prevail with some that are *weak and possessed*

posseſſed, yet they will ſcarce thereby advance their Reputation with the truly *judicious*. However the *best* that can be looked for in this cause, may be ex-pected from the *Dr.* and what it is, is now to be con-ſidered.

He layes down ſeveral *Observations*. "The first
"of them is this, That the main ground of the Peo-
"ple's interest, was founded upon the Apostles Ca-
"non, that a Bishop must be blameleſs and of good
"report^a, p. 312, 313.

This *rule* of the *Apostle's* was one ground, upon which the peoples *interest* in the *choice* of their Bi-
shop and other Officers was founded; but it was not the only ground. *Cyprian*, *Chrysſtome* and others, conclude it from other places of Scripture. But this might be ſufficient, if there were no other, to found their *right* or *power* in *elections*. For the *testimony* re-
quired, was not only of their good or ill behaviour, which a *Heathen* might give; but ſuch as ſignified that they judged them *fit* and *worthy* to be, and ſo *desired* them for, their Officers; which is not a meer *declarative* *testimony*, but ſuch as is *elective*. And this will be cleared by the *Authors* which the *Dr.* cites afterwards.

"Pag. 314. And there is a very conſiderable testi-
"mony in the Epiftle of *Clemens* to this purpose,
"where he gives an account how the Apostles, preach-
"ing through Cities and Countreys, did appoint
"their first fruits, having made a ſpiritual trial of
"them, to be Bishops and Deacons of thoſe who
"were to believe.

By the Apostles *appointing*, may be meant, either the *inſtituting* of thoſe Officers, and then it is not for the *Dr's* purpose; or else their *fixing* thoſe Officers in particular places. That they *fixed* Officers in any places

^a *1 Tim. 3. 2. 7.*

placees where there were no Christians, is an Imagination which he doth not seem to own; and where there was Christians, *Clemens* tells us afterwards, how their Officers were appointed, *viz.* with the *approbation or choice of the whole Church.*

“ Here it is plain they were of the Apostles appointment, and not of the Peoples choice. *Ibid.*

This is no way plain, an hundred instances might be produced of Officers appointed for a People, and yet *chosen* by them. But there needs no more than the *Dr.* helps us to in this very *page*. Immediately before these words, he mentions the first choice of *Deacons*, and there it is plain and express by the Text, that they were *chosen by the People*, and yet *appointed by the Apostles*. And in the words of *Clemens*, cited presently after, Bishops are to be *chosen*, and yet also *appointed* by the Apostles, or other eminent men. The *Dr.* thus renders his words: “ There-“ fore foreseeing these things perfectly, they appoint-“ e the persons before mentioned, and left the di-“ stribution of their Offices with this instruction, that “ as some dyed, other approved men should be *chosen* “ into their Offices. How and by whom they are to be chosen, the next words express, *overeundationes mōnū- mī exāmīnātōnēs*, the *whole Church having approved them*, i. e. having signified that they thought them worthy, and most fit to be their Officers, which includes a *desire* that they be *appointed* or set over them. This *declared* either when they are proposed by themselves or others, is *the choice* we are concerned for. Here 'tis manifest by *Clemens*, that *this was the Apostles practice*, and that they left *order* that in after-times Bishops should be thus *appointed*, and *thus chosen*.

The *Dr.* makes some Observations upon this Testimony

mony of *Clemens*, pag. 315. *First*, "That these Officers of the Church were not chosen by the People, but appointed by the Apostles, or other great men according to their order.

Whereas by *Clemens* his words it is plain to the contrary, that these Officers of the Church were both chosen by the people, and appointed by the Apostles, and that according to their order. They ordained, that their own practice in appointing Officers should be followed in after-times, *viz.* that as some dyed, others should be chosen, the whole Church approving them, into their Office, and appointed thereto by other eminent men. This is the plain import of *Clemens* his words.

" 2. *He observes*, that they took this course on purpose to prevent the contentions that might happen in the Church, about those who should bear Office in it.

The course he means is the appointing of Officers, without the choice of the People. But this appears to be a mistake, and if it were not so, the universal Church both in the best Ages and many after, did run counter to the order of the Apostles, made on purpose to prevent contentions in the Church.

" 3. *He observes*, that all that the people had to do, was to give testimony, or to express their approbation of those who were so appointed.

But *Clemens* speaks nothing of a bare testimony. He speaks expresly of all the peoples approbation as requisite by the Apostles order, and this, we have shewed, imports no less than the peoples choice ; and this in the constant fence and practice of the Church was previous to the settling of any Pastor over them. Yet he adds ; "For he could not allow their power of chusing, since he sayes the Apostles appointed Officers

“ ficers to prevent the contentions that might happen
“ about it.

But it doth not appear that they appointed Officers to prevent the contentions in Elections, nor can it appear by any thing Clemens sayes, but rather the contrary, since he tells us, Officers were both to be approved (or, which is all one, chosen) by the People, and appointed by the Apostles. And this leaves no ground for his following Supposition, that the ‘ Caufe of the disturbance made by some Men in the Church of Corinth, was because their Officers were appointed by others, not chosen by themselves. What pretence could there be for this, when according to the Apostles Order, (to which that Church was conform’d,) no Officer was appointed without the approbation of the whole Church?

‘ Pag. 316. And this is plain even from St. Cyprian, where he Discourseth of this matter, &c. for the force of what St. Cyprian saith, comes at last only to this giving Testimony.

But what if in Cyprian, the Peoples giving Testimony be no less than Chusing by Suffrage? The Clergy had no less Interest in the Election of a Bishop than the People, yet he expresses the Clergies concurrence in the Choice, by their Testimony, and the Peoples by their Suffrage b. *Factus est Cornelius Episcopus—de Clericorum penè omnium Testimonio, de Plebis quæ tunc affuit Suffragio: Cornelius was made Bishop by the Testimony of almost all the Clergy, and by the Suffrage of the People that were present.* And in the same place he saith, *Cornelius was Ordained both by the Suffrage of the Clergy and the People.* In the very next passage, cited by the Dr. out of this blessed Martyr, there is an Intimation of a Testimony in the Peoples presence, but the Suffrage of all is expressly mentioned, as requisite,

site, that the Ordination may be *Just and Lawful*. Take it as the Dr. offers it, pag. 316. that by 'their presence, either their faults might be Published, or their good acts Commended ; that so it may appear to be a *Just and Lawful Ordination, which hath been examined by the Suffrage and Judgment of all.*

To this he adds, the People there had a share in the Election, but it was in matter of Testimony concerning the good or ill behaviour of the Person.

It is as plain, as one would desire it should be spoken, that the People had such a share in the Elections as that they were carried by their general *Suffrage* ; and this was so necessary, that the Ordination of a Bishop could not appear to be *Just or Lawful without it*. If their giving *Testimony* amount to *no less*, than the Peoples *Choice* by suffrage, the Popular Elections which are in Question are granted : But if it be *less*, and *Cyprian* be said to allow the People *no more* ; violence is offer'd to his Words, plainly expressed, and more than once repeated.

The *Original* of this Practice (the People thus chusing their Bishop) and the universal *Observance* of it, is next expressed. He had said before that it did *de Divina Authoritate descendere, descend to them from Divine Authority*, that it was *Secundum Divina Magisteria, according to Divine Edicts*. Here he sayes it is of *Divine delivery* and *Apostolical Observance*, and as such to be *diligently kept and upheld*. And for the *Extent* of it, he sayes, It was *Observed almost through all Provinces*. He speaks modestly, for there might be some Provinces which he was not acquainted with, or some where Christianity did not yet prevail. The Dr. renders his Words thus, 'And therefore, he saith, It was almost a general custom among them, and he thinks came down from *Di-*

“vive Tradition and Apostolical Practice, that when any People wanted a Bishop, Neighbour Bishops met together in that place, and the new Bishop was chosen, Plebe *præsente*, the People being present (not by the Votes of the People.)

The People being present, not by the Votes of the People, as the Dr. notes. But Cyprian had said a little before, that it was *Omnium Suffragio*, by all their Votes; and he sayes it again in that Period, and the very next Words to these which the Dr. translates, though he thought not fit to add them. And this was Observed in the Consecration of their fellow Bishop Sabinus; (so far the Dr. but Cyprian goes on) *Ut de universæ Fraternitatis Suffragio, that by the Voices of all the Brethren, and the Judgment of the Bishops that were present, the Bishopric might be conferred on him, and hands laid on him instead of Basilides.* And he sayes it in divers other Epistles, besides this. He declares, *Cornelius* was made Bishop, *de Plebis Suffragio*, by the Votes of the People, and that he was Ordained, *Cleri & Plebis Suffragio*, by the Suffrage of the Clergy and the People^c. He tells his own People, that those who were against his being Bishop, were against their Suffrage (which he elsewhere Styles, *Divina Suffragia*) and against the Judgment of God^d.

Where he doth express the Consent of the People, but he requires the Judgment of the Bishops.

He expresses the Consent of the People declared by their Votes, as previous to the Ordination, and the way whereby *Sabinus* came to be Bishop. And whereas the Dr. seems to intimate, that Judgment was more than Consent ^b if it was more, yet was it not thought too much for the People. In this Epistle it is said to be of Divine Authority, that the Bishop be chosen in the presence of all, and approved by the Publick Judgment as worthy

^c Ep. 52.

^d Ep. 40.

worthy and fit for the Office ; and afterwards , that the Ordination may be Just and Lawful , he sayes , it is to be examined by the Judgment of all .

Vid. Ep. 41.

“ St. Cyprian and the African Bishops , who writ this Epistle to the People , say , That it belonged chiefly to them , to chuse the good , and refuse the bad , which is the strongest Testimony in Antiquity for the Peoples Power .

It is a strong and clear Testimony , and in Truth all the Dr.’s attempts to weaken it , have made it appear stronger to me than it did before . There’s no fear but it will stand firm and unmoved , whoever would shake it ; when the attaques of a Person of such excellent Learning and other Abilities can make no more impression on it .

But let us view the particulars he thinks fit to be considered . “ 1. It was in a case where a Bishop had voluntarily resigned .

But the Rule laid down by Cyprian and his Colleagues is general , asserting the Power of the People in all Cases , for chusing such as were worthy , and rejecting the unworthy .

“ 2. Another Bishop was put into his room , not by the Power of the People , but by the Judgment and Ordination of the Neighbour Bishops .

It is as plain as can be spoken , that Sabinus was put into the room of Basilius , not only by the Judgment and Ordination of the Bishops , but also by the Power of the Peoples Votes , *de universa Fraternitatis Suffragio* . Nay , the African Fathers determine , that the People have most of all this Power , *Plebs maximè potestatem habet , &c.*

“ 3. They had the judgment of a whole Council of African Bishops for their deserting him .

And we have in this *Epistle* the judgment, not only of *Cyprian*, but of a whole Council of *African Bishops*, both for the power and manner of the peoples chusing; the divine authority for it, and the universality of the practice; and also for their Power of deserting those Bishops which deserved it. The Names of above thirty of those Bishops are prefixed to this *Epistle*.

“ 4. For a notorious matter of fact, viz. Idolatry and Blasphemy, by his own confession.

The rule of the *African Fathers* is general, and not confined to this particular case, nor the grounds of it; but extends to any other wickedness, which may render Bishops unworthy to be owned.

“ 5. All the proof which St. *Cyprian* brings for this, doth amount to no more than that the People were most concerned to give testimony as to the good or bad lives of their Bishops.

Cyprian and the *Council* of Bishops with him, prove what they say concerning the power of the people in this matter; and they say not only that the people are to be present when a Bishop is to be ordained, and to give testimony concerning his good or ill deportment; but also that their consent is requisite; their judgement is to be interposed in examining, and approving such as are offer'd; and that they have the greatest power in chusing and rejecting Bishops; and that Elections are to be made by their concurring Votes and suffrage, that so the ordination of a Bishop may be just and lawful; and judge they are lead to this by divine Authority. This is evident by the *Synodical Epistle* and the *Premises*. Now let any that are impartial, and are not willing to be lead into mistakes, judge whether this amount to no more, than only the peoples giving testimony concerning the good or bad lives of their Bishops: This is no more than the *Heathens* had

had liberty to do in the ordinations of Bishōps, and can any one imagine that all the expressions in this *Epistle*, concerning the *power* and *priviledge* of Christians in the choice of those *Pastors* who were entrusted with their Souls, amount to no more than what *infidels* might challenge in reference to Christian Bishōps? In another case one would be apt to think, that he who thus represents *ancient Authors*, did not take the course to be be trusted in reporting matters of Antiquity. But in this case, I would not give way to such a thought, but honour the *Dr.* more, than he hath done himself in this busines.

Bishop *Bilson*, a very learned *Prelate*, who was little more a friend to popular Elections than the *Dr.* (and had produced as much against them as any, *Bellarmino* not excepted, if not *all* that others have made use of since) yet was so ingenuous as to yield *that* in antiquity, which cannot modestly be denied. “The fullest words, (saves he) that the “Greek Authors use for all the parts of *Election*, as “to *Propose*, to *Name*, to *Chuse*, to *Decree*, are in the “*stories Ecclesiastical* applyed to the *people*. And af-“terwards thus: So that in the *Primitive Church*, the “people did *Propose*, *Name*, *Elect* and *Decree*, as well “as the *Clergy*; and though the *Presbyters* had more “skill to judge, yet the *people* had as much Right “to chuse their *Pastor*, and if the most part of them “did agree, they did carry it from the *Clergy* &c.

Alexander Severus, in proposing the names of his Officers to the People, to hear what they had to object against them, did but imitate *part* of the Christians practice, and a small part of it too, and what was not the peculiar priviledge of Christians; for Heathens had the like liberty, and their objections might be heard in reference to the *Candidates* for Church

*Perpet. Go-
vern. of the
Church, c. 15.
p. 359. 560.*

Church Offices. And therefore it is no wonder, if no man can hence imagine that the people had power to make the *Governours of Roman Provinces*. But if the people of these Provinces had obtained as much power to chuse those *Governours*, as the Christians had to elect their *Bishops*, and the *Emperour* could have no more declined whom they had chosen in one case, than the *Ordainers* could in the other; the former might as well have been said to make their *Governours*, as the latter are said to make their *Bishops*.

f De Sacerdot. With Chrysostome they are, το δικαιον των πολυων. And Orat. 3. g Her. 73. Num. in Epiphanius, οι λαοι — δικαιονται των καταρχαντων, they make Bishops for themselves.

Origen hath nothing, either in the Words as they are cited, or as indeed they are in the *Homily*, against *Elections* by the People *de jure* or *de facto*; nor any thing which signifies that the People of *Christ* had no more to do in the choice of their *Pastors*, than meerly giving a *Declarative Testimony*, such as the *Heathen* were allowed to give, and therefore I wave it.

“The 2d. Considerable is, that the People upon this “Assuming the Power of *Elections* caused great disturbances and disorders in the Church.

The People *Assumed* not the Power of *Elections* at any time which can be assigned after the beginning of *Christianity*; they had it at *first*. If the People took to themselves any Power herein, which was not their proper Right, they *Usurped* it, and the *Usurpation* is to be charged, not upon the People alone, but the whole Church; for both Clergy and People concurred in those *Elections*, and made account they had *Apostolical Warrant* for it, and were taught so to do, by *Cyprian*, and others of the *Ancients*. That it was the practice of the Church every where for the People to *Chuse* their own *Pastors*, is evident by those

instances which are here brought against it ; for there could be no disturbances or disorders in their *Choice*, if they did not *Chuse*. And the *disturbances* and *disorders* Objected, when duly weighed, can raise no prejudice against the universal practice of the Church, nor will be any just occasion to deprive the People of that Power which was by them exercised ; and is acknowledged by the *Ancient* Church to be their Right for so many Hundred Years, without any attempt to divest them of it ; though they were well acquainted with any disorders that fell out in the exercise thereof.

There is evidence that this was the practice of the Church for above a Thousand Years after *Christ*, there are about Ten *instances* of disorders therein, *great* and *small*, for so many Ages. Now if every order and usage, though of *Apostolical* Institution or allowance, should be exploded, because of some disorder happening about it once in a *Hundred* Years ; what would be left us that is Primitive or *Ancient* ?

But here we have but Four *instances* of any disturbance or disorders about Popular Elections that are considerable in this Case ; the rest he thinks not worthy of much notice, or fit to be insisted on : And so they are huddled up without giving us the Words of his *Authors*, or sufficient Direction where to find divers of them. As for the Four which he makes and gives more account of, there are some mistakes about them, (such as I never Observed the *Dr.* to be liable to in any *other Cause*,) which set right, the instances will not be Serviceable to his purpose.

“ He begins with the disorders at *Antioch* thus,
 “ pag. 318. *Ensebim* represents the disorders at *Antioch* to have been so great in the City, upon the
 “ Choice of a New Bishop, by the divisions of the
 “ People.

"People, that they were like to have shaken the
"Emperours kindnes to the Christians, &c: And af-
"ter much trouble to the Emperour, and many meet-
"ings of Bishops, at last *Eustathius* was Chosen.

Eustathius was not *Chosen* at the end of those trou-
bles, but being *Chosen* peaceably long before, his *De-
position* was the beginning of them; nor was he ever
after, there *Chosen* or Restored. He was *Deposited*
by a *Synod* of *Arian* Bishops at *Antioch*, under a pre-
tence that he was a *Sabellian* (as the *Arians* were
wont to Brand those, who opposed their *Heresie*) so
^{h Lib. 1. c. 23.} *Socrates* ^h. Those of that *Faction* in the Town would
have *Chosen* (in the place of *Eustathius*, wrong-
fully ejected) *Eusebius Pamphilus*, then Bishop of *Ce-
sarea*, whom they took to be of that *Perswasion*; and
so violent and irregular were their proceedings there-
in, not only to the disturbing of the Civil Peace,
but violating the *Constitutions* of the Church, (offer-
ing to Chuse one who was Bishop of another Place;

^{i Euseb. de vit. Constantini. l. 3. c. 57.} as the Emperour signifies ⁱ,) that all the disturbance
may be justly imputed to them, as *Aggressors*, thrust-
ing out him who had the Right, and striving to
force in him who could have none. Now is it fair,
to make use of the violent attempts of the *Arians*,
Enemies of the Church and the common Faith; to
derive *Odium* upon the practice of the *Catholick*
Church?

"The next is at *Cesarea*. *Gregory Nazianzen* sets
forth the mighty unrulines of the People of *Cesa-
rea* in the Choice of their Bishop, saying, it came
to a dangerous Sedition, and not easie to be sup-
pressed, &c. pag. 318, 319.

We find two hot Contests in Elections there, one
immediately after the other: whether of them he
means, helets us not understand. The first was about
the

the Choice of *Ensebius*. *Nazianzen* (who alone is said to complain of the *mighty unruliness* of the People) sayes no worse of it in the issue than this, that they proceeded indeed *not very orderly*, *καὶ παντοτε*, but *very faithfully and zealously*^k, and thereby signifies how horribly Seditious it was in his account. And his Father, the *Senior Gregory*, Bishop of *Nazianzum*, justifies the Action in *Letters* to the *Gouvernour* as *regular*, and *acceptable* to God, and defends what they did as, *ὑπὸ τοῦ Ιησοῦς*, done *rightly and justly*^l. The ^k *Orat. 19.*
^{pag. 308.} ^l *Ibid. pag. 310.*

other Contest was in the Choice of *Basil*, and he, justly styled a Person of *incomparable worth*, *carried it*, though with some difficulty (the *Rulers* and the *worst* of the People joining with them, making some opposition.) There was no need to have reckoned these among the *most dangerous Seditions*, they might have been passed by, but only that *Nazianzen* complains so much of the inconvenience of Popular Elections, *that he wished them alter'd*, and *the Elections brought to the Clergy*, as the *Dr.* tells us. Some observe that *Nazianzen* had sometimes Wishes, which would now be counted odd and untoward. Once he *Wished* that there were no *Episcopal Preeminence*, no *τερψία*, by which that *Preeminence* is most commonly expressed, both by himself and others^m. Another time he was ⁿ *οὐτ. 28.* ready to *Wish* there were no Synods of Bishops, and was resolved, for his part, *never to come at any, having never seen any good Issue of them*. But he was a very excellent Person, and should not be wronged. He did not *Wish*, what is here said, *That Elections might be brought to the Clergy* (that is, the Clergy *alone*; that must be the meaning, or else he is made to Wish for that, which he had already) he would not have the Power lie in them *only*, but *in them and the Select and more Holy part of the People*;

τὸν ἐπαγγελματικὸν) neither in both these *only*, but
in *them only*, or chiefly, ἐν τοῖς μείζοις οὖσα.

n Orat. 19.
pag. 310.

The Third Instance hath no less of mistake in it, or rather more, such as renders it wholly impertinent. "It is a Sedition at *Alexandria*. *Evagrius* "faith, The Sedition at *Alexandria* was intolerable, "upon the division of the People between *Dioscorus* "and *Proterius*, the People rising against the Magi- "strates and Souldiers who endeavoured to keep "them in order, and at last they Murther'd *Prote-* "rius, Pag. 319.

But this Sedition was not raised at the Election of *Proterius*, who succeeded *Dioscorus*, but after he was *Installed*, and *Confirmed*, by the common Suffrage of a meeting at *Alexandria*^o. No part of the *Tumult* but was some time after this, but the most *Tragical* part, when *Proterius* was Murther'd, was Five or Six Years after. And shall *Popular Elections* be decryed upon the account of a Sedition whereof nothing appeared at the *Election*? Besides, those who moved Sedition and committed the said outrages, were Enemies of the Council of *Chalcedon*, and of the Faith then maintained against *Eutyches*. These were the chief *Actors*, and the *Incendiaries* were *Timotheus Aelurus*, some *Bishops* and *Monks*, who upon that account had separated from the *Catholick Church*, as the *Egyptian Bishops* and *Clergy* shew in their *Narrative* sent to *Leo the Emperour* p. Now shall the People who adhere to the common Faith suffer in their Power or Liberty, because some *Hereticks* in opposition to them do act outrageously?

"He proceeds to another at *Rome* upon the Choice "of *Damasus*, which came to Bloodshed for several "dayes, and is particularly related by *Amianus* " *Marcellinus*, &c.

^o *Evagri. l. 2.*
^{cap. 5.}

^p *Idem. ibid. c. 8.*

Ammianus in the *Book cited*, discovers the rise and ground of that outrageous action, to which it may be truly ascribed, and without which the election might have been as orderly and innocent, as in other places. After he had described this *Church Tragedy*, in which a hundred thirty seven persons were slain, he adds, *I cannot deny considering the pomp and bravery at Rome, but those that aspire to that (Bishoprick) should with all their might strive to attain it, since having compassed it, they will be at once enriched Matronarum oblationibus, with the oblations of Matrons, carried abroad in Chariots, speciously attired, and faring so deliciously, that their Feasts are more than Princely, so that the riches, state, and pleasures wherewith the *Chair at Rome* accomodated those Bishops, incited them to make their way to it with all the force they could engage, though they could not pass but through blood and slaughters.* Then he subjoyns, *they might have been happy (and so avoided this and other miseries) if despising this grandeur, they would have imitated the Bishops in the Provinces, whose poor fare, and mean habit, and humble lowly carriage, commended them both to God and good men.* The smallness and poorness of the *Bishopricks* in other places, secured them from such scandalous proceedings, and temptations to them. We hear no complaints of any outrages or irregularities in elections to such *Bishopricks*, nor to any that were of the ancient and *primitive form and state*. Not one instance is brought for three hundred years after *Christ*, of any such disorders in the *Choice of Bishops*. But as *Bishopricks* transgressed the *ancient bounds*, and swelled bigger and bigger, distempers increased accordingly, and had their *paroxysms* now and then, such as this at *Rome*. These are not *natural* to elections by the people, their *order and innocence*

ence for so many Ages, shews it, but *accidental*, and *occasional*; and when the disorders are ascribed to their true and proper causes and occasions, these elections will be acquitted. When the *World* was let into the *Church*, and the *Church* cast into the *model* of the *Empire*, no wonder if the *Church-men* acted where they had temptations, and would have others act like the men of this *World*.

But are these tolerable inconveniences? The worst of them are no wayes in the *nature* of the thing, but occasioned by accidents forreign to it, and such as may fall out in the best institutions the *Church* has and observes; and how *intolerable* soever they may seem, the ancient *Church* thought it more *intolerable* to exclude the people from the *liberty* of chusing.

What is alledged out of *Chrysostome*, *Jerome*, and *Origen*, with some reflection upon the people, I need not examine, unless it were of more moment. If it be not applicable to those who succeed the people in this *power*; yet did not these excellent persons think it a sufficient ground to decry the *current practice* and *sense* of the *Church*, by which popular elections were upheld and maintained, both in their times and long after.

Come we to the *third* thing he will have us consider, " pag. 320. To prevent these inconveniences many Bishops were appointed, without the "Choice of the people, and *Canons* were made "for the regulation of elections. In the *Church* of "Alexandria, the Choice of the Bishop belonged to "the twelve Presbyters, who was to be chosen not "only *out* of the twelve Presbyters, but *by* them. For this *Jerome*, *Severus*, &c. are cited.

But *Jerome* did not say, that the Bishop was chosen

sen by the Presbyters, but *out of* them, *Unum ex se* (not *à se*) *electum Episcopum nominabant* ^{q.} Nor doth ^{Epist. ad} *Severus*, as he is cited, say that it belonged to the ^{Evag.} Presbyters *alone*. And if there be no evidence that they did it *alone*, we need not be solicitous about what *Elmacinus* faith concerning its original or continuance. The alteration which *Hilary* speaks of, concerns not those who were to *chuse*, but those *out of whom* the Bishop was to be chosen. Formerly one of these Presbyters was to be elected, but now the most deserving person might be chosen, whether of that body or not. So he not speaking of any change made as to the *Electors*, for any thing he sayes, the same persons who did chuse in his time, did so before; and the Electors in that age were not only the *Presbyters*, but both *Clergy* and *people*, not in other Churches alone, but this particularly of *Alexandria*, as appears by the election of *Athanasius*, *Peter* and other Bishops there, made *Ἄντε τῷ λαῷ μαρτίῳ*.

But though that of *Jerome*, on whom the rest cited depend, will not serve to prove the *sole* power of Presbyters to chuse; yet it may be a proof of their power to do something greater, *viz.* to *ordain their Bishops*. And this use is made of it by very learned persons, and particularly (not to mention the most excellent *Primate Usher*) by *D. St* ^{s.} whom we may see arguing it, *like himself*, with learning and judgement.

He seems not unwilling that what the counterfeit *Ambrose* speaks of the *Bishops dying*, and the *next in course succeeding*, should pass for a *particular conceit* of that Author; and with more reason may it so pass, if he would have the *next* succeed though *not worthy*; or the people *no way* to interpose their judgment concerning such *unworthiness*. But of this he expresses nothing.

^r *Naz. Orat. 21.*
^{Tibidor. i. 4. c.}
^{18.}

^s *Iren. pag. 273.*

^{“H2}

He proceeds, pag. 321. "We find the Bishops consecrating others in several Churches, without any mention of choice made by the People.

But this is no tolerable arguing, *there is no mention of any*, therefore *there was none*. Otherwise where a Bishop is said to be made, and no *mention* made of any Ordination, but only of Election by the People, it might be concluded that a Bishop had *no Ordination*. As when *Nazianzen* speaks of *Athanasius*'s coming to the Chair at *Alexandria* by the *Votes of all the People*, without mentioning his *Ordination*^t; and when *Jerome* speaks of a Bishop elected by the People, without any mention of his *Ordination*^u, would it be

^t *Orat. 21.*

^{P. 377.}

^u *In Ezek. 1.10.*
^{c. 33.}

thought tolerable to inferre from hence that a Bishop was made without *Ordination*? Or when one is said to be constituted Bishop of a Church, without mention either of *Election* or *Ordination*, doth it follow that he was made Bishop there without either? An hundred Instances hereof may be found in *Eusebius*, the *Author* cited; but we need go no further than the very place which the *Dr.* makes use of. *Eusebius* sayes, that *Germanio* succeeded *Dius* in the Bishoprick at *Jerusalem*, and *after him Gordius*, in whose time *Narcissus* returned^{*}; he mentions no *Ordination* or *Election* of either. And *Alexander* was settled Bishop there, by the desires and Importunity of the People, encouraged therein by Revelation, but no mention of his *Ordination*; only it is said, the People did it with the *common consent of the Bishops thereabouts*^x.

^{*} *Euseb. 1. 6.*
^{c. 10.}

^x *Cap. 11.*

" *Severus* Bishop of *Milevis* in his Life-time appointed his Successour, and acquainted the Clergy with it, but not the People, great disturbance was feared thereupon, &c.

For a Bishop to appoint his Successour was both against the ordinary *practice* and *rules* of the ancient Church.

Church. It is prohibited by divers Synods, and particularly by that at *Antioch*^a. But *Severus* committed another error, not acquainting the People with it, and this was like to be of dangerous consequence, *thercupon great disturbance was feared*. St. *Austin* himself shews his dislike of this Omission; *Minus aliquid factum erat, unde nonnulli contristabantur*; *Something was neglected, at which divers were grieved*. And what was that? *Ad Populum non est locutus*; He spake not to the People of it. But *Austin* coming amongst them, took care to make up this defect, by prevailing with the People for their consent and approbation, as himself tells us; otherwise *Severus* might have been defeated of his designed Successour. St. *Austin* would not run into such a Mistake, but when he desired a Successour, calls the People together, propounds *Eradius*, and obtains for him a fair *Election by the People*, with their Subscriptions, signifying their approbation of him, and *that they willed and desired* what *Austin* propounded, as appears by divers Expressions in that Epistle b.

^a Can. 23. in
Code 102.

“ So *Paulus* the *Novatian* Bishop at *Constantinople*, “ appointed his Successor *Marcianus*, to prevent the “ Contentions that might happen after his death, and “ got his Presbyters to consent to it.

^b Epist. 110.

But the designed Successour was neither ordained, nor admitted till the People had declared their desire and approbation of him; *that is*, till they had chosen him. For three dayes after the death of *Paulus*, the Paper wherein he expressed his desire that *Marcian* should succeed him, being opened before the People (a great multitude) *they all with one voice declare aloud that he was worthy*; which amounts to no less than an unanimous choice of him c. And after this *Marcian* being found out, he was ordained and installed. So that

^c Socrat. His.
Lib. 7. Cap. 46.

that the *Novatians*, though on another account they pass for *Schismaticks*; yet are not found, no, not in this singular Instance (of a Bishops designing his Successour) to vary from the practice of the *Catholicks*, in admitting the people to chuse their own *Pastor*.

Thus far we can find no evidence, that either for the preventing of *supposed Inconveniencies* or other accounts, any Bishop was settled in a Church without the Choice of the People. Let us next see what *Canons* were made for the *regulation of Elections* so as to bereave the People of this Priviledge, or diminish their Power.

"The Greek Canonists are of opinion that the "Council of *Nice* took away all Power of Election "of Bishops from the People, and gave it to the Bi- "shops of the Province.

Those Canonists (if any beside *Balsamo*) were herein greatly mistaken, as most learned men judge and prove; nor do I think the *Dr.* is of another mind. If he had thought the reasous of this conceit to be of any force, he would have produced them. That this *Council* was far from excluding the People from the Power of chusing their Bishops, is apparent enough by their *Synodical Epistle* to those of *Alexandria* and *Egypt*, where they declare their judgments, that if any Bishops decease, others reconciled to the Church may be admitted in their room, *if they be worthy, καὶ οἱ αἰρεῖται, and the People do chuse them*^d.

"It is apparent from the Council of *Antioch*, that "Bishops were sometimes consecrated without the "consent of the People, for it doth suppose a "Bishop after *consecration* may not be received by "his People.

The question is not, whether the Election *went before*

^d *In Socrat.*
I. 1. c. 6.

fore the Ordination or *followed*, but whether any Bishop might have the Chair, and be possessed of the Bishoprick without the Peoples Consent. This Canon doth not suppose that he might, but rather on the contrary ; It plainly signifies, that the *People might refuse a Bishop after he was consecrated* ; and in that case, by the *Canon* he may retain the *Honour and Office*, but the *Place* he comes not at. For that was a *rule* in the *ancient Church* religiously observed, and the violation of it counted intolerable ; *Sicut antiqui Canones decreverunt, nullus invitis detur Episcopus* ; *As. e Con. Arel. 5. Can. 11.* *the ancient Canons have decreed, let no Bishop be offer'd to the People without their Consent.* Such Ordinations of Bishops whom no Church desired, were not usual, but by the Council of *Chalcedon* they are plainly forbid, and declared to be Nullities. *f Con. 6.*

Out of another *Canon* he would shew that the *Consecration of a Bishop, was not then performed in his own Church.*

It was so by ancient *Custom*, as *Cyprian* declares, and also by later *Canons*, *the Bishop was to be ordained among his own People*. Whether it be so or no by this *Canon* is not material, since *Elections* by the *People* *Can. 8.* are not at all concerned in it.

“ *Gregory* subscribed at *Antioch*, as Bishop of *Alexandria*, before ever he went thither.

The way wherein *Gregory* proceeded to that Bishoprick, is utterly condemned by the most eminent Bishops in all parts, that were not *Arians* ; particularly in the *West* by *Julius* at *Rome*^h, in the *South* by *Athanasius*^h *Apud Athan. Apol. 2.* *of Alexandria*ⁱ, in the *East* by *Nazianzen*^k. It was an *Epis. ad S. solit.* irregular and turbulent act of the *Arians*, such were *ad Orth. 4.* they who at *Antioch* made *Gregory* Bishop, and then *Orat. 21.* sent him with Military Power to *Alexandria*, to take possession by force of Arms, and expell the great *Athanasius*.

maius. If instances had not been very scarce, this would have been waved!

[†]*Socrat.* 1. 7.
c. 10, 11.

“ So St. Basil mentions his Consecration of *Euphronius* to be Bishop of *Nicopolis*, without any consent of the People before.

If St. *Basil* did constitute *Euphrorius* without the previous consent of the People, which was not usual; yet he did not offer to settle him in the Chair, till he had gained the consent and Approbation of the Synod and People, as the *Dr.*’s words (*but he persuades the Senate and People to accept of him,*) do plainly signify. But indeed St. *Basil* doth not say, that his consecrating of *Euphrorius* to be Bishop of *Nicopolis*, *was without any consent of the People before*, (though the *Dr.* would have it so,) nor find I any thing in that Epistle to prove it. *Basil* there signifies the contrary when he saith, *The People judged him worthy, and the Bishops consented,* (*αξιον εἶναι καὶ ψήσις οδούσαι, καὶ σημεῖον οντείσθαι*,) which imports that the People first declared their approbation and desire of him, and thereupon the Bishops consented to ordain him. Its true, he saith, what the Governours do in Church Affairs, have *their Confirmation* (*βεβαιώσαι*), *from the People*, and so wishes them *to receive the Bishop given them*. But a Bishop was ordinarily given them, *i. e.* ordained for them, upon their antecedent desire to have it so. This the *Dr.* knows, and signifies in the next words.

“ If the People did agree upon a Person to be Bishop, their way then was to Petition the *Metropolitan* and his *Synod*, who had the full Power either “ to allow, or refuse him.

The usual way was, after Synods were settled by Rule (as they were in the Fourth Age) for the People when they wanted a Bishop, to meet together

ther, and chose one whom they thought fit, by unanimous Consent, or the Major Vote of the Clergy and People; and then to draw up a *Writing* with the *Subscriptions* of the Electors, called by the *Latines Decretum*, and by the Greeks *Ψήσισμα*, and sending this to the *Synod*, thereby signified whom they had Chosen, with a desire that he might be ordained; which done, the *Consecrators*, Metropolitan or other Bishops, had *no Power* at all to refuse the Person Elected, if he was duly qualified; and in case he was not, they had *no Power* to put another upon them, but only to advise them to proceed to the Choice of another, as might be made manifest by unquestionable Authorities ^m. Yea such deference had they for *Elections* by the People, that if they had *Chosen*, one who was *uncapable* by the *Canons*, if the *capacity* could any way be removed, the *Electi*^{15.} was allowed, and the *Ordainers* proceeded upon it. This is evident in the *Election* of *Eusebius*, at *Cesarea*, and *Nectarius* at *Constantinople*, and *Ambrose* at *Millan*; who were Chosen by the People to be Bishops in the places mentioned, not only before they were *Ordained*, but before they were *Baptized*, yet the *Elections* stood good, and being *Baptized* first, and after *Ordained*, they were admitted to those *Bishopricks*.

“ It is evident from the Twelfth *Canon* of *Laodicea*, that although all the People chose a Bishop, “ if he intruded himself into the Possession of his *See*, “ without the Consent of a Provincial *Synod*, he was “ to be turned out or rejected by them. Which “ shews how much the business of *Elections* was “ brought into the Bishops *Power* in the *Eastern* parts.

I find nothing of this in *that* or any other *Canon* of that *Synod*, but there is some such thing in the

Greg. Lib. 6.

Ep. 38. Lib. 7.

Ep. 34. Lib. 8.

Ep. 40. Dis. 62.

Sixteenth Canon of the Council at Antioch, and the reason of it was, lest an unworthy Person should intrude into a Bishoprick, the Synod was first to be satisfied of his sufficiency; but then if he was found qualified according to the *Canons*, the Synod had no power to with-hold him from those by whom he was Chosen, nor to Chuse another for them if they judged him uncapable. Thus the busines of *Elections* was no more brought into the *Bishops Power* in the *Eastern* parts (where he intimates their Power herein was greatest,) than the busines of *Ordinations* was brought into the *Peoples Power*; for if the *Bishops* could put him by who was unworthy, though the People had *Chosen* him; so the *People* might refuse him whom the *Bishops Consecrated*, if they were not satisfied in him; nay more, for the *Bishops Power* was limited to the *Care* of the *Candidates* insufficiency, but the *People* might refuse a Person commend-ed by the *Bishops* as sufficient, if they did not like him on other accounts. The consequence of *Ordain-ing* One for the *People*, or putting one upon them whom they desired not; was intolerable in the judgment of the *Ancient Church*. *Leo*, a *Bishop* of greatest Reputation in his time, thus expressed it. *Nullus invitus, & non petentibus ordinetur*, *Let no Bishop be Ordained for those who are unwilling, and do not desire him*. And the Reason wherewith he inforces it, is very considerable; since it is not only an Argument for those times, but extends to all ages, and leaves it not tolerable at any time, *Nè plebs invita Episcopum non optatum aut contemnat aut oderit, & fiat minus re-ligio a quam convenient, cui non licuerit habere quem voluit* ⁿ; *Lest the People not consenting, do either contemn or hate a Bishop whom they desire not; and become less Relig-i-ous than they should be, when they may not have such a one as they would have.* Let

ⁿ Ep. 84. c. 5. *ligio a quam convenient, cui non licuerit habere quem voluit* ⁿ; *Lest the People not consenting, do either contemn or hate a Bishop whom they desire not; and become less Relig-i-ous than they should be, when they may not have such a one as they would have.*

Let me only add, that those who have any respect for *Modern Bishops*, such as get Possession of their *Sees*, without regard either of the Peoples *Choice* or the *Consent* of a *Provincial Synod*, ought to beware of this Canon; since it leaves them no more Title to any *Episcopal Chair*, than *Bassianus* and *Stephanus* had to that at *Ephesus*, when upon this account, they were ejected by the Sentence of the *Fathers* at *Chaledon*, and the greatest *Council* that the Ancient Church ever had.

“ By the law of *Justinian*, the common people were “ excluded from elections of Bishops, and the Clergy and “ better sort of Citizens were to nominate *three* to “ the *Metropolitan*, out of which he was to chuse “ *one*.

The Law of that *Emperour* enjoyns, that the *Clergy* and *better sort* of *Citizens* do draw up the *electing decree*, (Ἐπιστολαὶ τοῦν), but doth not enjoyn that the other *Citizens* be excluded from concurring in the *Election* or to make any without their liking. In the *Code* we have another of his Laws, where it is enacted; *that the choice be made προς τὸν ἀνέραν τὸν πόλεων*, o *De Episcopis.* *Lex 42.* by the *Inhabitants* of the *City*, in general, without any discrimination. Nor doth the former *constitution* oblige them precisely to chuse and present *three*, they have liberty *by it*, if they find not *three sufficient* persons (and none appointed to be *Judges* thereof but themselves) to name *two* or but *one*.

“ By the Canon of *Laodicea*, the common people “ were excluded from the power of chusing any in “ to the *Clergy*, for they were wont to raise tumults “ upon such occasions.

That *Canon*, in *Bishop Bilsons* judgment, concerns only *Presbyters* p: The meaning of it is this, that it is p *Ubi supra* not fit *Elections* should be left to the *rabble* (ὥγεις) on f. 15. p. 342. only

only or chiefly, without the Clergy and better sort of the people, who may keep the rest in order, and prevent tumults. The import of the words ἀριστερῶν and ὀχλῶν lead us thus to understand it ; and the sense and practice of the Church every where at that time, expressed in the *Councils* and the *best Writers of that age*, wherein the *Synod* was held, will not suffer us to take it in any sense, exclusive of the interest of the *common people* in the choice of their *Pastors* ; unless we will have it to be a singular *capricio* of a few *Bishops* in this *Assembly*, in opposition to the common sentiments of the *Christian World*.

^{q Can. 3.} “The second Council of *Nice* restrained the elections only to *Bishops* ^q, pag. 323.

The third Canon of that Council determines, that the *Magistrates appointing* of *Bishops* is a *nullity* ; confirming it by an ancient *Canon* (one of those which pass'd for *Apostolical*.) But that clause whereby *Bellarmino* and others will have elections restrained to *Bishops* is mistaken, *ordinations* being thereby intended, not *elections* ; which is apparent because they cite for it the *fourth Canon* of the first Council of *Nice*, in which *Episcopal Ordinations* are appropriated to *Bishops*, but nothing expressed, or intimated concerning *Elections*. Thus is this passage alledged by the *Dr.* understood ^{r Ibid. pag. 369} by *Bishop Bilson* ; and thereby all advantages are cut off which others would make of it, against elections by the people.

The eighth Council of *Constantinople*, might as well have been spared, confirming neither the *former*, nor any thing else for the *Dr.*'s purpose, though it be said *the people are here excluded with an Anathema*. It is well the *curse* came no sooner, than towards the latter end of the *ninth Age*. But what if that *Synod* never *anathematized* any such thing ? The *Ca-*

non cited for it is the twenty eighth, which in other Latin Copies is the twenty second, but the *Greek Edition* hath but fourteen in all ; and the *Greek Church* (whose Council it was) owns no more ; so that this *Canon* looks no better, than a piece of (some *Latins*) forgery.

I need not add that this Synod was ten years after condemned, by a far more numerous Council at the same place. *Baronius* gives a full account of it, though with such reflexions upon *Photius* and his adherents as is suitable to his usual partiality. But it seems there is great scarcity of Evidence when this *Canon* and that of the *second Nicene* Council cited immediately before, must be made use of : seeing this leaves the way of making Bishops now used amongst us, under a *Curse* ; the other makes our Bishops however consecrated to be no *Bishops*, and will have those debarred from communion who *communicate* with them. And this is considerable, as grounded upon an ancient *Canon*. Indeed it was the fence of the ancient Church for many Ages, if we may judge thereof by Councils or Writers in those Ages, not only that Bishops ought to be chosen by the people, but that none ought to be owned as Bishops who were not so chosen.

“ The fourth thing he would have considered is, “ that when there were Christian Magistrates, they “ did interpose in this matter as they judged expedient.

He brings many instances, I shall begin with those which seem less pertinent, and so proceed to the rest.

“ After the Death of *Alexander* Bishop of *Constantinople*, the People fell into Parties, some were for *Paulus*, and others for *Macedonius* ; the Emperour *Constantius* coming hither puts them both by, and

“ ap-

"appoints *Eusebius* of *Nicomedia* to be Bishop there. The *Arians* were so hot and violent for the promoting of their *Party*, that they transgressed the *Rules* and *Usages* of the Church, trampling on all that stood in their way. This did *Constantius*, and his Design was utterly to subvert the *Christian Faith* in that main Fundamental of it, concerning the *Eternal God-head of Christ* ^s.

^s *Socrat.* 1. 6.
c. 7.

In order hereto he thrust out those, who according to the Rule and Order of the Church, were *only Chosen* by such who adhered to the true Faith, particularly *Paulus*; and gives the *Chair* to *Eusebius* of *Nicomedia*, the *Antesignanus* of the *Arians*, and one who by his great Interest, subtle Counsels, and mischievous Actions, did more propagate *Arianism*, than *Arius* himself: and afterwards gives order that *Paulus* be banished, and that *Macedonius*, one as bad or worse than *Eusebius*, should have the Chair, *not according to the Rule of the Church, but by the will of the Governour*, as the *Historian Notes* ^t, and his way is made to it through the Death of three Thousand one Hundred and Fifty of the People. Now this is scarce a proper *Instance*, for that was proposed to be given in *Christian Emperours*, but the *Arians* were not counted *Christians*. *Athanasius* proves they ought not to be

^u *Orat.* 1. 2. so called in divers *Orations* ^u, and *Constantius* was an ⁴ *Arian*, indeed a great *Zealot* for promoting of that

^w *Lib. 2.C.15.* *Heresie*, and suppressing the True Faith. He banish-

^x *Lib. 4.C.32.* ed the *Orthodox Bishops*, saith *Theodoret* ^w. He made

a Law for the utter demolishing of their Churches, ^y *Lib. 4.C.13.14.* sayes *Socrates* ^x. He commanded *Athanasius* to be

kill'd, and proposed rewards to those that would assassin him; and raised a general *Persecution* against the Professors of the True Faith, *much like to those*

under the Heathen Emperours, sayes *Sordmen* ^y. What such

such a Prince did against the Rule and Practice of the True Church, and the Rights of the Faithful People in *Elections*, will rather commend them, than be any prejudice to them.

“ When *Athanasius* was restored, *Constantius* declared it “ was by the Decree of the Synod and by his Consent, and he “ by his Authority restored likewise *Paulus* and *Marcellus*, &c.

But to what purpose is this alledged? Is there no difference between *Chusing* and *Restoring*? How did *Constantius* interpose for the *hindring* of the Peoples Elections, by *Restoring* those Bishops, who were before duly Chosen by the People? Their Choice hereby is rather countenanced and confirmed. I can discern no Reason why it is made use of against it. There seems to be neither Proof nor Pertinency in these Instances.

“ After the Death of *Sisinnius*, the Emperour declared “ that to prevent disturbance he would have none of the “ Clergy of *Constantinople* Chosen Bishop there, and so “ *Nestorius* was brought from *Antioch*.

But his being brought from *Antioch*, is no Proof that he was not Chosen by the People; for *Chrysostome* was brought from the same place, and was none of the Clergy of *Constantinople*, more than *Nestorius*, yet was called thither and placed in the *Chair* by the *Votes of the People*, as will appear presently. And why should it be thought *Nestorius* was not Chosen by the People? Doth *Socrates*, cited as giving this account of him, say he was not? No, but he doth not mention his Choice. Nor doth he speak a word of his *Ordination*, shall we therefore conclude that he was neither Elected nor Ordained? If this were an Argument, there are Hundreds that we must account Bishops, without either Ordination or Election. But though there be no Reason why we should think that *Nestorius* was not Chosen, yet there is apparent Reason, why the Choice should not be mentioned. For an unanimous *Choice* by the People was an *Honour*, and wont to be put among the

Encomiums of worthy Bishops. But *Nestorius* after he got the Chair, answered not their expectation, but shew'd himself worthy of an ill Character, both by his Actions and Judgment; and so in fine was Condemned as a *Heretick* by a *general Council* at *Ephesus*, and banished by the Emperour. Thereupon the *Historian* might think himself concerned to wave that, which was *much* for the Honour of one who so little deserved it.

There are *Three or Four Instances* which seem more pertinent, and considerable, which I have therefore taken the Liberty to put together; but indeed there is some mistake in them, I would not say they are misrepresented.

"So *Constantine* did in the Church of *Antioch*, when there "was great Dissention there, upon the Deposition of *Eustathius*, he recommended to the Synod *Euphronius* of "Cappadocia, and *Georgius* of *Arethusa*, or whom they should "judge fit, without taking any notice of the Interest of the People.

But how doth it appear that *Constantine* took no notice of the *Interest of the People*? No otherwise, but because *Sozomen* speaks not of it. Of what weight this Argument is we have seen before. But what if another *Author* declare that he did take notice of it? *Eusebius*, who knew the whole Matter as well and better than *Sozomen*, being particularly concerned therein; tells us plainly that *Constantine* did, in his Letters to the People of *Antioch*, take notice of the *Peoples Interest* in the Choice of their Bishop. For, sayes he, the Emperour advises them not to desire the Bishop of another Church (in reference to *Eusebius*, whom they had a mind to, though he was then Bishop of *Cesarea*) but according to the Custome, or Decree of the Church, to chuse one to be their Pastor, as the Common Saviour, did direct them,

^{2. Euseb.} ^{De vita} ^{Constant.} ^{Liber. 3. c. 57.} *Sequuntur ex eiusdem rursus apud eam notitiae.* And in the Emperour's Epistle there are divers expressions which signifie no less.

"When *Gregory Nazianzen* resigned the Bishoprick of "Constantinople, *Theodosius* commended to the Bishops the "care

“ care of finding out a Person, who recommending many to
“ him, the *Emperour* himself pitched upon *Nectarius*, and
“ would have him made Bishop, &c.

If this will any way serve the purpose for which it is alledged, the *Emperour* must pitch upon *Nectarius*, so as to have him made Bishop *without any previous Choice* of the People; but there’s no ground for this, nay, there’s clear and unquestionable evidence against it. For the General Council at *Constantinople*, in the latter end of their *Synodical Epistle* to the *Western Bishops*, declared that *Nectarius* was *Chosen by the Suffrage of the whole City*. We have, say these Fathers, *ordained Nectarius, with the unanimous concurrence of this ecumenical Synod, all the Clergy, and all the City giving their Voices for it,*

τὸν ἵππον τῆς πόλεως a.

“ When *Chrysostome* was chosen at *Constantinople*, the Royal
“ Assent was given by *Arcadius*, the election being made, faith
“ *Sozomen*, by the people and Clergy, but *Palladius* gives a
“ more particular account of it, &c. pag. 324.

^a In Theodo. Hist. lib. 5. cap. 9.

About the Choice of *Chrysostome* to *Constantinople*, *Sozomen* fayes, the *Clergy and People having Voted it, ἀπολαμβάνων δι τῶν τοῦ θανάτου καὶ καρκίνου*, the *Emperour* gave his Consent. *Socrates* fayes, That by the common Decree, *ἀπολαμβάνων* of the *Clergy and People*, the *Emperour* sent for him to *Constantinople* b. But *Palladius* gives a more particular Account, fayes he: Yet in that Account and the words cited for that purpose, there is nothing at all which denyes that *Chrysostome* was thus unanimously chosen by the people. Now shall we believe that *Chrysostome* was not thus chosen upon the testimony of *Palladius*, who doth not deny it; against two credible Witnesses who positively and expressly affirm that such was the choice? To these might be added the *Writers* of the life of *Chrysostome*, particularly *George Patriarch of Alexandria*, who as *Phorius* declares, made his collections out of *Palladius*, among others c.

^b Lib. 6. cap. 2.

“ So that there was no antecedent election of the people, as *Sozomen* fayes, but whatever there was, was subsequent to
“ the Emperours determination.

^c In Chrys. Soz. Tom. 2 pag. 183.

Sozo-

Sozomen is here contradicted without ground and to little purpose. Whether the election was antecedent or no, is not material; since the Emperours determination was neither against nor without the peoples Choice; yet evidence is produced for the election as *antecedent*, and none at all against it.

Maximianus being dead, he gave order that *Proclus* should be made Bishop before the others body was buried.

Maximianus being dead, the Emperour, (*imperator* is the *Historians* word,) permitted *Proclus*, so that if he was not chosen, the Emperour interposed not there, by positive order, but by permission only. But indeed *Proclus* in an election before had the *voices of the Major part* for him, and so had carried it, but for a groundless suggestion that the *Canons* did forbid it. This being but about *two years* before, the place was again void by the death of *Maximianus*, and the fence and desires of the people for *Proclus* being sufficiently known by their late Suffrages, a new election was not needful, but he admitted to be installed without more ado.

Thus we have made it manifest, that all these instances are not sufficient to shew, that *any one truly Christian Prince did from the first think fit*, upon any occasion, to make use of their Authority, either to deprive the people of their *power in Elections*, or to obtrude any Bishops upon the Churches without the Peoples Choice. As for *Constantius*, being an *Arian*, the ancient Church did not esteem him a Christian, *Hilary* makes bold to call him *Antichrist*. And what he did to the prejudice of the peoples Priviledge herein, since it was done to promote *Arianism* and for the subversion of the *Christian Faith*, is little more to be regarded, or drawn into example, than if *Julian* had done the like in favour of *Heathenism*.

The two last heads concern only the usages of latter times, which I had no design to take notice of.